

VOLUME 4. Parts 4/6
pp. 63—158.

WINCHES FARM
395, HATFIELD Herts
25th May, 1950
ST. ALBANS, HERTS

THE BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

26 MAY 1950

The Official Organ of

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Edited by

FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

CONTENTS :

	Page
<i>The Official Record of Proceedings of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature at its Session held in Paris in July 1948 :</i>	
Conclusions of Fourth Meeting (<i>concluding portion</i>) - - - - -	63-82
Conclusions of Fifth Meeting - - - - -	83-106
Conclusions of Sixth Meeting (<i>first instalment</i>) - - - - -	107-158

LONDON :

Printed by Order of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature on instructions received from the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, 1948,
and

Sold on behalf of the International Commission by the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature
at the Publications Office of the Trust
41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7.

1950

Price One pound, eight shillings.

(All rights reserved)

**Telegrams
despatched by the
Acting President
on behalf of the
Commission**

2. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) recalled that at their first meeting during their present Session the Commission had invited him to address a telegram to Commissioner Th. Mortensen (Denmark) expressing their regret that ill-health prevented him from being present at the Session now in progress, and that at their second meeting the Commission had invited him to address telegrams to President Karl Jordan expressing their regret at his decision to relinquish the Office of President and to the Right Honourable Walter Elliot expressing their thanks for his having accepted the Presidency of the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature. In the discharge of these requests, he had now despatched the following telegrams :—

(Previous reference:
Paris Session, 1st
Meeting,
Conclusion 4)

(a) *Telegram to Commissioner Th. Mortensen*

“ The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature sincerely regret that your health makes it impossible for you to be present with them in Paris and send you their best wishes for speedy recovery.”

(Previous reference:
Paris Session, 2nd
Meeting,
Conclusion 18(6))

(b) *Telegram to President Karl Jordan*

“ The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature assembled in Paris have received your resignation of the Presidency with deep regret but feel bound to respect your wishes and to relieve you of the burden of office. They propose, however, to renominate you as a member of the Commission and intend to invite the Congress to appoint you also as Honorary Life-President.”

(Previous reference:
Paris Session, 2nd
Meeting,
Conclusion 27)

(c) *Telegram to the Right Honourable Walter Elliot*

“ At this their first meeting since the formation of the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature, the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature now assembled in Paris desire to express their grateful thanks to you for accepting the Presidency of the Trust.”

THE COMMISSION :—

took note of, and thanked the Acting President for taking, the action on their behalf reported above.

**Meaning of the
expression
“ nomenclature
binaire ” as used
in the “ Règles ”**

3. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a note by the Secretary to the Commission covering the draft of a Report to be submitted by the Commission to the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology on the meaning of the expression “ nomenclature binaire ” as used in the *Règles* (Commission Paper I.C.(48)5).

In introducing this paper, THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) recalled that for many years there had been controversy regarding the meaning to be attached to the expression "nomenclature binaire" as used in Proviso (b) to Article 25 of the *Règles*. There had been violent dissension on this subject at the meeting of the Congress held at Padua in 1930, when the Section on Nomenclature had (by a majority) adopted a resolution on the interpretation to be given to this expression. That resolution had been invalid because it had been put to the vote, notwithstanding the fact that prior notice of the intention to move this resolution had not been given by its proposer to the Commission. That action was in contravention of a decision taken by the Congress of Cambridge (1898) and confirmed by the Congress of Berlin (1901) that, except with the concurrence of the Commission, no resolution relating to the *Règles* was to be put to the vote in the Section on Nomenclature, unless at least one year's notice had been given to the Commission. The situation created by the Padua incident had been considered at Lisbon in 1935 by the *Comité Permanent des Congrès Internationaux de Zoologie* who had referred the whole matter back to the President of the Section on Nomenclature who in turn had invited the Commission to submit a Report thereon at the next meeting of the Congress. That invitation had been accepted by the Commission and this method of making a fresh approach to the subject had been approved by the Congress of Lisbon at its final plenary Session.

(Previous reference:
Lisbon Session, 5th
Meeting,
Conclusion 3)

The draft Report now submitted to the Commission for their consideration was the fruit of much discussion between himself, as Secretary to the Commission, and leading specialists in Europe and America. Those discussions led him to believe both that this question was no longer controversial and that the settlement suggested in the draft Report would be generally acceptable.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

- (1) to approve the text of the draft Report on the meaning of the expression "nomenclature binaire" as used in the *Règles* submitted by the Secretary to the Commission under cover of the memorandum circulated as Commission Paper I.C.(48)5 and to adopt that text as the text of the Report to be submitted by the Commission to the President of the Section on Nomenclature of the present Congress ;
- (2) to authorise and request the Secretary to the Commission to sign the Report adopted in (1) above and to submit it forthwith on behalf of

the Commission to the President of the Section on Nomenclature;

(3) in pursuance of the terms of the Report referred to above:—

(a) to recommend the Congress:—

(i) to substitute the expression “nomenclature binominale” for the expression “nomenclature binaire” in Article 25 and Article 26 of the *Règles*;

(ii) to attach to the *Règles* a Schedule, to be known as the “First Schedule,” in contrast to the present *Appendice*, here recommended in future to be known as the “Second Schedule,” and to direct that every decision, whether to validate or to suppress a given book or name or to alter the usage of a name, taken, or hereafter to be taken, by the Commission under their plenary powers be recorded in the said First Schedule;

(iii) to insert in the Article recommended to be inserted in the *Règles* embodying, subject to certain agreed amendments, the provisions of the Plenary Powers Resolution of 1913 (*Declaration* 5) a provision exempting applications relating to the status of generic names published after 1757 by authors who in the book or paper concerned did not apply the principles of binomial nomenclature from the requirement that a specified period shall elapse between the date on which the application in question is published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* and the date on which the Commission may take a final decision thereon;

(iv) to insert in the First Schedule to the *Règles* the entry “Brisson (M.J.), 1760, *Ornithologia sive Synopsis methodica sistens Avium Divisionem in Ordines*” as the title of a book, generic names in which are to be accepted as having availability under

(For a later decision regarding the numbering of the Schedules to the “Règles”, see Paris Session, 9th Meeting, Conclusion 31)

(Previous reference: Paris Session, 3rd Meeting, Conclusion 7(2))

Article 25, notwithstanding the fact that they were published by an author who in the work concerned did not apply the principles of binomial nomenclature;

- (b) to cancel *Opinions* 20 and 37, the interpretations of the *Règles* contained in which had now been ruled by the Commission as incorrect;
- (c) to substitute the words "who used a non-binomial nomenclature" for the words "who used a binary (Art. 25) (though not binomial) nomenclature" in the first sentence of the "summary" to *Opinion* 24;
- (d) to substitute the words "On the species eligible for selection as the type species of a genus established by a binomial author, where some or all of the originally included species were not cited by binomial names" for the words "Types of genera of binary but not binomial authors" as the title of *Opinion* 35;

(4) to congratulate the Secretary to the Commission on the masterly fashion in which he had marshalled the data relating to the meaning of the expression "nomenclature binaire" for the consideration of the Commission.

Consolidation and amendment of the "Règles" : preliminary consideration

4. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a memorandum by the Secretary to the Commission outlining proposals for the consolidation and amendment of the *Règles* (Commission Paper I.C.(48)6, Part 1).

THE COMMISSION :—

- (1) approved generally the proposals for the consolidation and amendment of the *Règles* submitted by the Secretary to the Commission in Commission Paper I.C.(48)6;
- (2) agreed to direct their energies towards securing :
 - (a) the incorporation in the *Règles* of provisions embodying the interpretations of existing Articles given by the Commission in interpretative *Opinions* already rendered, subject to such modifications or exceptions as they might consider proper;
 - (b) the clarification of certain provisions in the *Règles* relating to important questions on nomenclature, where the meaning of those

(Later reference:
Paris Session, 6th
Meeting,
Conclusion 10)

(Later reference:
Paris Session,
4th Meeting,
Conclusion 13)

(Later reference:
Paris Session,
6th Meeting,
Conclusion 1)

(Later reference:
Paris Session,
5th Meeting,
Conclusion 1)

(Later reference:
Paris Session,
6th Meeting,
Conclusion 50)

**Status of new
names published in
a form or in a
manner
contravening
Articles 14-16, 18 and
20**

provisions was in dispute, e.g. :—

- (i) the meaning of the expression "indication" as used in relation to generic names in Proviso (a) to Article 25;
- (ii) the meaning of the provisions in Articles 35 and 36 relating to specific homonyms;
- (iii) the status, if any, of names proposed for forms of less than subspecific rank;
- (c) the clarification of certain provisions in the *Règles*, where the implication of those provisions was in doubt;
- (d) the insertion in the *Règles* of provisions on various matters not dealt with in any of the existing Articles;
- (e) the substitution of "*Recommandations*" for mandatory provisions in certain cases;
- (f) the incorporation in the *Règles* of provisions embodying resolutions on nomenclature and nomenclatorial practice adopted at various times by the Commission or by the Commission and the Congress and subsequently recorded in *Declarations* rendered by the Commission;
- (g) the remedying of grammatical and other defects in the *Règles* due to careless or inexpert drafting;
- (h) the completion of the substantive French text of the *Règles*;
- (i) the securing of accurate translations in English and other languages of the substantive French text of the *Règles*.

5. In the course of the discussion recorded in Conclusion 4(2)(c) above, THE COMMISSION had under consideration the position arising when a new name was published in a form or in a manner which contravened one or other of Articles 14-16, 18 and 20 (Commission Paper I.C.(48)6, paragraph 11). The *Règles* did not make it clear whether a name so published was to be corrected automatically by later authors to make it conform with the requirements of the *Règles* or whether (as appeared to be implied by *Opinion* 8) a name published in contravention of any of the foregoing provisions was to be preserved for all time in the incorrect form in which it was originally published. An allied question on which a clarification of the *Règles* was required was whether, when a name was emended under Article 19,

that name in its emended form ranked for purposes of priority (1) from the date on which the name of which it was an emendation was published, or (2) only from the date on which the emendation was published. Arising out of this last point, there was also the question of the author to whom an emended name should be credited. Should it be the original author of the incorrectly formed name or the author by whom the emendation was published ?

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

- (1) to recommend that provisions should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear :—
 - (a) that, where a name is published in a form or in a manner which contravenes any of the provisions contained in Articles 14–16, 18 or Article 20, the error so committed is automatically to be corrected by subsequent authors ;
 - (b) that, where a name is originally published in a form or in a manner which contravenes any of the Articles specified in (a) above but later that error is removed by the name being corrected or by the form of its citation being altered, as the case may be, the name in its corrected form or with its corrected mode of citation ranks for purposes of priority from the date on which it was originally published in an incorrect form or in an incorrect manner and is to be attributed to the author by whom it was so published and not to the author by whom it was corrected or by whom it was first cited in a correct manner ;
 - (c) that, where a name is validly emended in accordance with the provisions of Article 19, that name ranks for purposes of priority from the date on which it was originally published in an incorrect form and is to be attributed to the author by whom it was so published ;
- (2) to cancel *Opinion 8*, the interpretation of the *Règles* contained in which was incorrect.

Article 25,
Proviso (c)(2) :
the expression
“definite
bibliographic
reference”

6. In the course of the discussion recorded in Conclusion 4(2)(e) above, the ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that the general policy recommended to the Commission was that ritualistic provisions, which had been included at different times in Article 25

(Law of Priority) and which had the unintended but unfortunate effect of invalidating names which, though otherwise properly published, were defective on some highly technical ground, should be replaced by others of a more liberal, i.e. less rigorous, character but that *Recommendations* should be added at appropriate points in Article 25 indicating the ideal procedure to be aimed at. The problem now to be considered was the position created by the insertion in Article 25 (by the Budapest Congress of 1927) of the provision that, in order to satisfy the requirements of that Article, a name published after 31st December, 1930, as a substitute for a previously published name must be accompanied by a "definite bibliographic reference" to the name to be replaced. At their meeting held at Lisbon in 1935 the Commission had considered a request for an elucidation of the meaning of this expression, and in answer to that question had ruled (*Opinion 138*) that this expression required that a new name published as a substitute name should be accompanied by a bibliographical reference consisting of the name to be replaced, its author, the date of its publication, the work or serial in which it was published, the number of the volume, if the work was published in more than one volume, and the number of the page on which the name appeared. In view of the use of the expression "definite bibliographic reference" in Article 25, no other interpretation could logically have been given by the Commission. This decision had had, however, an unfortunate effect, for it had invalidated names which were otherwise perfectly satisfactory, as had been pointed out in a communication submitted to the Commission by Dr. J. Brookes Knight (Washington) acting on behalf of the Joint Committee on Zoological Nomenclature for Paleontology in America (Commission File Z.N.(S)352).

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to recommend :—

(a) the deletion of Section (2) of Proviso (c) to Article 25 and the insertion in its place of a new Section (2) as follows :—

"in the case of a name proposed as a substitute for a name which is invalid by reason of being a homonym, with a reference to the name which is thereby replaced"

insertion of a *Recommandation* to Proviso (c)(2), urging authors, when publishing substitute names, to give a full bibliographical reference to the name so replaced, that is, to cite the name itself, its

author, the date on which it was published, the title of the book or serial in which it was published, the volume number where the book or serial consists of more than one volume, and the page number or, where the pages are not numbered, the number or letter or other mark distinguishing the portion of the text in which the name concerned was published;

(2) to cancel *Opinion* 138, as from the date on which Article 25 is amended in the sense recommended in (1) above, when that *Opinion*, by reason of referring to the existing text of Article 25, will have ceased to be applicable.

**Article 25,
Proviso (c)(1) :
the expression
"which
differentiate . . . "**

7. THE COMMISSION considered next the expression "with a summary of characters which differentiate or distinguish the genus or species from other genera or species," as used in Section (1) to Proviso (c) to Article 25. Professor H. B. Hungerford (U.S.A.) (Commission File Z.N.(S)61) had asked whether, under these words, it was necessary that a description of a new species, in order to make the new name available, must contain an express reference to, and a comparison with, some previously published species (see Hungerford, 1945, *Bull. Zool. Nomencl.* 1 : 102-103).

In the discussion which ensued, it was generally agreed that, though well-intentioned, this provision in Article 25 was open to the objection that it invalidated otherwise properly published names on a purely technical nomenclatorial ground. It was a ritualistic provision which should be modified in conformity with the principle adopted in dealing with the expression "definite bibliographic reference." What was needed was that this provision should require a higher standard for names published after 31st December, 1930, than for names published before that date (when all that was required was that the new name should be published with an "indication, definition or description"). The provision in question should, however, be less rigorous than that contained in the existing Section (1) to Proviso (c). It was pointed out that, if the requirement that the description should be comparative were to be deleted, the only distinction which could be drawn in this matter between names published on or after 1st January, 1931, and names published before 1st January, 1931, was between names which, when first published, had been accompanied by words giving particulars of characters and those which depended for their availability, in the case of

(For a later decision on the status of generic names published before 1st January 1931 without a type species, see Paris Session, 4th Meeting, Conclusion 13)

(For a decision to extend this provision consequent upon the admission of the names of forms of less than subspecific rank to rights under the Law of Priority, see Paris Session, 5th Meeting, Conclusion 1)

generic names, solely upon the designation or citation of a type species, and, in the case of the trivial names of species or subspecies, solely upon an accompanying figure or illustration.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

(1) the deletion of Section (1) of Proviso (c) to Article 25 and the insertion in its place of a new Section (1) as follows :—

“ with a statement in words indicating the characters of the genus, species or subspecies concerned.”

(2) to insert a *Recommandation* to Proviso (c)(1), urging authors, when drawing up descriptions of new genera, subgenera, species or subspecies to give not only an absolute, but also a comparative, description thereof, by indicating :—

- (a) *in the case of a generic or subgeneric name*, the characters which separate the genus or subgenus concerned from the previously described genus or subgenus to which it is considered that the new genus or subgenus is most closely allied ;
- (b) *in the case of a specific name*, the characters which separate the new species from the previously described species to which it is considered to be most closely allied, and, if that is a little-known species, the characters which separate the new species from a well-known or common species included in the genus ;
- (c) *in the case of a subspecific name*, the characters which distinguish the new subspecies from the subspecies to which it is considered to be most closely allied, and, if that is a little-known subspecies, the characters which distinguish the new subspecies from a well-known or common subspecies of the species concerned.

Article 25, Proviso (c)(3) : the expression “ definite unambiguous designation of the type species ” ; Article 29 and 30 consequential amendments

8. THE COMMISSION turned to the consideration of the expression “ definite unambiguous designation of the type species ” as used in Section (3) to Proviso (c) to Article 25. This question, which was referred to in paragraphs 13 and 15 of Commission Paper I.C.(48)6, had been brought to the attention of the Commission by Professor E. Gorton Linsley, on behalf of the American Committee on Entomological Nomenclature (Commission File Z.N.(S)342).

In the discussion of this problem, it was noted that this was another example of a well-intentioned provision which had the unintended effect of invalidating names on highly technical nomenclatorial grounds. For example, under this provision, a name published after 31st December, 1930 for a new monobasic genus was invalid, if the author of that genus failed to give a "definite unambiguous citation" of the type species. It was a ritualistic provision which should be modified in accordance with the principle adopted in the similar cases in Sections (1) and (2) of the same Proviso (Proviso (c)) to Article 25. There was general agreement that the reasonable course to adopt would be to provide that for the purposes of Section (3) of Proviso (c) a generic name published after 31st December, 1930, must have its type species clearly designated or, as the case may be, indicated in accordance with one or other of the Rules laid down in the first group of Rules (i.e. the group headed "Cases in which the generic type is accepted solely upon the basis of the original publication") given in the Article (Article 30) which lays down the way in which the type species of genera are to be determined.

(For a decision to amend the phraseology used in this part of Article 30, see Paris Session, 7th Meeting, Conclusion 5)

(For a decision amplifying this decision, see Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion 68)

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend:—

(1) to delete Section (3) to Proviso (c) to Article 25 and insert in its place a new Section (3) in the following sense:—

"in the case of a generic or subgeneric name, with a type species designated or, as the case may be, indicated in accordance with one or other of the rules prescribed for determining the type species of a genus or subgenus solely upon the basis of the original publication (i.e. Rules (a) to (d) in Article 30)"

(2) to add to Article 25 a *Recommandation* strongly urging every author, when publishing a name for a new genus or subgenus:—

(a) expressly to designate by name the type species of the genus or subgenus as the case may be;

(b) when designating as the type species a species the name of which has already been published, to cite that species, first under the binominal combination under which the species was originally published, giving at the same time a bibliographical reference to the place where that name was published, and second under its new binominal combination consisting of the new generic name and the trivial name of the species or, in the case of a new subgeneric name, of the generic

name of the species, the new subgeneric name and the trivial name of the species (an example of each type of case being added);

(3) that a similar *Recommandation* in relation to the selection of the type species of a genus by an author under Rule (g) in Article 30 be added to that Article and that the existing *Recommandation* to Article 29 be deleted.

Status of the provisions in the former "Appendice" now a Schedule to the "Règles"
(Previous reference: Paris Session, 4th Meeting, Conclusion 3(3)(a)(ii))

(For a later decision regarding the numbering of the Schedules to the "Règles" see Paris Session, 9th Meeting, Conclusion 31)

Grammatical inconsistencies in the "Règles"

Article 31 : need for the removal of confusion between taxonomy and nomenclature and for the substitution of direct provisions for the existing provisions by reference

9. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the proposals in regard to the status of the provisions in what was at present called the *Appendice* to the *Règles* but which it had been agreed to recommend should in future be styled the Second Schedule, submitted in paragraph 18(1) of Commission Paper I.C.(48)6.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that an Article should be inserted in the *Règles* referring to the Second Schedule (i.e. the present *Appendice*) and making it clear that the provisions included therein were not mandatory but were in the nature of recommendations as to good nomenclatorial practice.

10. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the recommendations submitted in paragraph 18(2) of Commission Paper I.C.(48)6, for the removal of grammatical inconsistencies from the *Règles*, particularly the random and haphazard use of the tenses of the verb "être" (to be).

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that, in the forthcoming revision of the *Règles*, care should be taken to remove the grammatical inconsistencies which mar the existing text and in particular to ensure the use of the correct tenses of the verb "être" (to be) to indicate the mandatory character of the Articles included in the *Règles* and the non-mandatory character of the provisions of the Second Schedule.

11. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the difficulties arising from the confusion in the *Règles* between taxonomy and nomenclature referred to in paragraph 18(3) of Commission Paper I.C.(48)6, with special reference to Article 31, which, as at present drafted, appeared to prescribe a procedure for the "subdivision d'une espèce" and the "subdivision d'un genre," both of which were taxonomic matters, with which a code of nomenclature was not directly concerned. What this Article was intended to provide for were the nomenclatorial implications of the

taxonomic operations in question and not the operations themselves. It was important that this defect should be eliminated from this Article. It was important also that specific instructions should be included in the *Règles* regarding the method to be followed in determining to which of two or more species originally included in a composite nominal species, the name given to that species should adhere. The aim should be to secure that Article 31 should apply as closely as possible to the type specimen of a nominal species the rules laid down in Article 30 for determining the type species of a genus, the name of which had been published prior to 1st January, 1931. Naturally, there should be included in Article 31 also provisions parallel to any provisions supplementing or clarifying the corresponding Rules in Article 30 which might be agreed upon during the present Congress.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

- (1) that in its present form Article 31 was defective, both because the phraseology involved implied a confusion between taxonomy and nomenclature, and because in so important a matter as that dealt with in this Article it was essential that the required provisions should be expressly stated and not left to be inferred by reference to another Article (Article 30) dealing with an only partially comparable question ;
- (2) in view of (1) above, to recommend that Article 31 in its present form should be deleted from the *Règles* and that in place of the present text of that Article there should be inserted provisions laying down for the determination of the identity of a nominal species rules parallel to those prescribed for determining the identity (i.e. the type species) of a genus in Article 29 and in Rules (a), (b), (c) and (g) in Article 30, that is to say provisions prescribing :—

- (a) that, where a nominal species is found to be a composite species, the name given to that nominal species is to be applied to one or other of the component species, and that where the original author of a nominal species designated a given specimen to be the type specimen of that nominal species or an illustration, figure, or previously published description exclusively to represent the type specimen, the name in question shall in all circumstances adhere to the taxonomic species represented by that specimen or, as the case may be, by the illustration, figure or previously published description so designated to represent that specimen (provision parallel to Article 29) ;

(Later reference:
Paris Session, 6th
Meeting,
Conclusion 26)

(For a later decision prescribing the terminology to be applied to type specimens, see Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion 75)

- (b) that, where an author publishes the name of a nominal species, based either (i) upon two or more specimens or (ii) partly upon one or more specimens and partly upon one or more illustrations or figures (whether then published for the first time or previously published) or upon one or more previously published descriptions or upon any combination of the above, the type specimen of the nominal species or, as the case may be, the illustration, figure or previously published description which shall thereafter exclusively represent the type specimen shall be determined in accordance with the following Rules applied successively (provision parallel to introductory portion of Article 30):—
 - (i) where at the time of the publication of the name of a nominal species the original author thereof designates either (1) one specimen to be the type specimen or (2) one illustration or one figure or one previously published description exclusively to represent the type specimen, the specimen, illustration, figure or previously published description so designated shall be the type specimen of the nominal species or, as the case may be, shall thereafter exclusively represent the type specimen (Rule parallel to Rule (a) in Article 30);
 - (ii) where, in default of a type designation under (i) above, the original author of the name of a nominal species indicates that one but not more than one specimen is the type specimen by affixing thereto a label bearing the legend "type" or its equivalent, the specimen so labelled shall be the type specimen of that nominal species (Rule parallel to Rule (b) in Article 30);
 - (iii) where neither Rule (i) nor Rule (ii) above is applicable (1) any one specimen included in the original author's type material, not being a specimen excluded from consideration under (d) below, or (2) any one of the illustrations, figures or published descriptions cited in the original description of the nominal species which is the first subsequently to be selected by the same or another author to be the type specimen or, as the case may be, exclusively to represent the type specimen, shall be the type specimen of that nominal species or shall exclusively represent that specimen, the expressions "select the type specimen" and "select to represent the type specimen" to be rigidly construed and to exclude the application of the trivial name of the nominal species concerned to a single originally included specimen, illustration, figure or previously published description, unaccompanied by a clear indication that a selection is being made (Rule parallel to Rule (g) in Article 30);
- (c) that, where an author publishes the name of a nominal species based exclusively (i) upon a single specimen, or (ii) upon a single illustration or figure (whether then published for the first time or previously published) or (iii) upon a single previously published description, the single specimen or the single illustration or figure or the single previously published description in question shall be, or, as the case may be, shall exclusively represent, the type specimen of that nominal species (Rule parallel to Rule (c) in Article 30);

- (d) that no specimen, illustration, figure or previously published description is eligible to be selected to be the type specimen, or, as the case may be, to represent the type specimen, of a nominal species, if that specimen, illustration, figure or description was only doubtfully referred to the nominal species by the original author in his description of that species or was, or represented, a *specimen inquirendum* from the standpoint of that author (provision parallel to Rule (e) in Article 30) ;
- (e) that the interpretation of Rule (g) in Article 30 in relation to the type species of genera given in the Commission's *Opinion* 6, shall apply to the type specimen of a nominal species, only where the name of such a species was published prior to 1st January, 1931 and where that species was based upon two, but not more than two, specimens and one of those specimens was later designated as the type specimen of another nominal species by the same or another author ;
- (f) that, where, prior to 1st January, 1931, two or more nominal species were founded, in whole or in part, upon the same type material, any one specimen which formed part of the type material of both nominal species may be selected as the type specimen of either or both of the nominal species concerned (provision parallel to that applied to Article 30 by *Opinion* 62) ;
- (g) that, where an author, when publishing the name of a nominal species, either (i) omits to specify the material on which that nominal species is based and it is later found impossible to trace that material, or (ii) specifies his type material, but that material either (a) is so imperfect or in such bad condition as to render it impossible to recognise the taxonomic species of which it consists, or (b) was lost or destroyed before the identity of the taxonomic species in question was established, the following rules are to be applied :—
 - (1) where, in spite of the lack of a holotype or lectotype or, as the case may be, of a recognisable holotype or lectotype, specialists are able to recognise the taxonomic species represented by the nominal species in question the name of that nominal species shall apply to the taxonomic species so recognised ;
 - (2) where specialists are agreed that the available evidence is insufficient to permit of the identification of the taxonomic species represented by the nominal species in question, the name of that nominal species is to be treated as a *nomina dubium* and therefore not available for use for taxonomic purposes ;
 - (3) where some but not all specialists claim to be able to recognise the taxonomic species represented by the nominal species in question or where there is disagreement among specialists as to the taxonomic species so to be recognised, the question at issue is to be referred to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for decision ;
- (h) that the provisions now to be inserted in the *Règles* should include also the provisions embodied in the second sentence ("Un nom . . . dans les genres séparés") of the existing text of Article 31.

Substantive French text of the "Règles": arrangements to be made for completion and promulgation

12. THE COMMISSION turned next to the proposals relating to the drafting of passages for incorporation in the substantive French text of the *Règles* for which at present only English texts existed, submitted in paragraph 19 of

Commission Paper I.C.(48)6, and to the preparation of corresponding drafts to give effect to additions and other changes agreed upon at the present (Paris) meeting, submitted in Part 2 (paragraphs 22-27) of the same Paper.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(1) to recommend :—

- (a) that the present Congress should not itself draft passages to be inserted in the substantive French text of the *Règles* either for the purpose of completing those portions for which at present only English texts existed or for the purpose of giving effect to decisions to make additions to, or changes in, the *Règles* taken by the present Congress, but, in view of the highly technical nature of the task involved in drafting such passages, should instruct the Commission as soon as possible after the close of the Congress to refer all the relevant documents to jurists, with instructions that they should prepare the draft of a revised substantive French text of the *Règles*, together with a literal translation thereof in the English language ;
- (b) that, when the draft texts prepared by the jurists in accordance with (a) above were received by the Secretary to the Commission, he should forthwith communicate one copy to each Member of the Commission and to each zoologist who served as an Alternate Member thereof during the Paris Session, with a request that the Member or Alternate Member of the Commission concerned should compare the drafts with the decisions recorded in the Official Record of the Proceedings of the Commission at its Paris Session, as approved by the Congress, and should notify to the Secretary, as soon as possible and in any case within a period of three calendar months calculated from the date of despatch of the draft texts from the Secretariat of the Commission, any discrepancy or apparent discrepancy which he may have noted ;
- (c) that, on the expiry of the period of three months referred to in (b) above or such earlier date by which all members of the

(For a later decision substituting an ad hoc Committee for the Executive Committee, see Paris Session, 11th Meeting, Conclusion 5)

(Later reference: Paris Session, 12th Meeting, Conclusion 26)

Commission may have furnished their comments to the Secretary to the Commission, that Officer, after such further consultations with the jurists as he may consider necessary, shall refer the comments received under (b) above to the Executive Committee of the Commission for final decision ;

- (d) that, as soon as decisions have been taken by the Executive Committee on the matters referred to them under (c) above, the Secretary to the Commission should prepare for publication at the earliest possible moment an edition of the *Règles* consisting of the revised substantive French text on left-hand pages and of the corresponding literal translation into English on right-hand pages, the two texts to be printed so as to secure line for line correspondence ;
- (e) that, as soon as might be practicable after the publication of the foregoing edition of the *Règles*, arrangements should be made by the Commission for the publication of editions consisting in each case of the revised substantive French text accompanied in the first case by an authoritative translation into the German language, in the second case of a translation into the Italian language and in the third case of a corresponding translation into the Spanish language ;

- (2) to take note with satisfaction that, thanks partly to the financial assistance anticipated from UNESCO and partly to a special grant made by the Royal Society of London, it was intended to place the revised edition of the *Règles* on sale at a very low price.

Article 25,
Proviso (a) :
meaning of
expression
“ indication ” in
relation to generic
names

13. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a memorandum submitted by the Secretary to the Commission on the subject of the meaning, in relation to generic names, of the expression “ indication ” as used in Proviso (a) to Article 25 of the *Règles* (Commission Paper I.C.(48)7). Up till 1944 the general but not universal practice of zoologists had been to assume that a generic name was published with an “ indication ” (and therefore complied with the requirements of Proviso (a) to Article 25) if on the first publication of the generic name, previously

published nominal species were cited thereunder, irrespective of whether any descriptive words characterising the genus were published at the same time. In 1944 the Secretary published a note drawing attention to the interpretation of the expression "indication" given by the Commission in their *Opinion 1* (first published in 1907) which made it clear that this interpretation of the expression "indication" was wider than was justified by the existing law and that it was only when a genus was monotypical or was established with a designated type that a generic name given to it without any descriptive matter possessed any availability under Article 25. In order to clarify the position as regards existing practice, the Joint Committee on Zoological Nomenclature for Paleontology in America had thereupon drawn up a questionnaire which they had distributed to a large body of representative taxonomists in the United States and the United Kingdom. This investigation had elicited 87 significant replies, of which 76 stated that the more liberal interpretation of the expression "indication" was employed in the field of the specialist consulted or was employed by that specialist in his own work or should, in his view, be employed in preference to the narrower interpretation given in *Opinion 1*. This latter interpretation was supported by only 11 of the specialists consulted. The replies showed also that in no single branch of the Animal Kingdom did a majority of the specialists consulted favour the interpretation given in *Opinion 1*, and that in this matter American and British zoologists had an identical outlook (the figures being for United States zoologists, 52 to 6 in favour of the more liberal interpretation, and for British zoologists, 24 to 5). In submitting to the Commission the replies received in answer to the questionnaire, together with a summary, of which the foregoing is an abstract, the Joint Committee had invited the Commission to amend *Opinion 1* in such a way as to secure that a generic name published with "one or more validly named species" but without descriptive matter should be regarded as having been published with an "indication" within the meaning of Proviso (a) to Article 25.

In placing this problem before the Commission, THE ACTING PRESIDENT said that zoologists generally were under a debt of gratitude to the Joint Committee on Zoological Nomenclature for Paleontology in America for the careful preparatory work which they had undertaken before submitting their recommendations to the Commission. That preparatory work had greatly simplified the issues involved and would correspondingly ease the task of the Commission in reaching a decision. Proceeding,

(Previous reference:
Paris Session,
4th Meeting,
Conclusion 5(2))

the Acting President recalled that the Commission itself possessed no legislative functions; its functions were judicial and concerned therefore with the interpretation of the *Règles*; once, therefore, the Commission had given a judicial interpretation of the meaning of a given provision in the *Règles*, it was powerless, as a body, to vary that interpretation, unless it could be established that that interpretation itself was in conflict with the express provisions of the *Règles*, as, for example, it had now been agreed had been the case in the interpretation of Article 14 given in *Opinion* 8. Apart from an exceptional case of this kind, the only way to secure that a given provision of the *Règles* should bear a meaning different from the interpretation given by the Commission in an *Opinion* was to obtain from the Congress a decision to amend the provision concerned. Immediately upon the adoption of such an amendment, the earlier interpretation given by the Commission would lapse, the *Opinion* in which that interpretation had been given ceasing to have any further relevance. On receiving the application in the present matter from the Joint Committee, he, as Secretary to the Commission, had re-examined *Opinion* 1 and had come to the conclusion that no technical flaw could be detected in it. In preparing the paper now submitted, he had accordingly recommended the Commission to invite the Congress to secure the desired end by means of an express amendment of the provisions of Article 25.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

- (1) to recommend that Proviso (a) to Article 25 should be so amended as to secure that a generic or subgeneric name published before 1st January, 1931, shall be available under that Article as from the date of its original publication not only when (as at present) it was then accompanied by a definition or description or when the genus was monotypical or when a type species was designated or indicated by the original author when publishing the name but also when the name, on being first published, was accompanied by no verbal definition or description, the only indication given being that provided by the citation under the generic or subgeneric name concerned of the names of one or more previously published nominal species;
- (2) simultaneously with the adoption of the recommendation submitted in (1) above, to cancel as being no longer applicable the interpretation of Proviso (a) to Article 25 given in Section (B)(3) of *Opinion* 1.

Status of names proposed for forms of less than subspecific rank : preliminary consideration
(Previous reference: Lisbon Session, 2nd Meeting, Conclusion 17)

14. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that the next item to be considered by the Commission was the question of the status of names proposed for forms of infra-subspecific rank. Preliminary consideration had been given to this subject by the Commission at their meeting held at Lisbon in 1935, when they had had before them a resolution on this subject adopted by the Fifth International Congress of Entomology at its meeting held in Paris in 1932. The Commission had decided at Lisbon that the time then at their disposal would not suffice to enable them to deal adequately with the problems involved in the resolution submitted by the Congress of Entomology. They had accordingly decided to invite the Secretary to the Commission to confer with specialists in representative branches of the Animal Kingdom regarding the status to be accorded to names proposed for forms of less than subspecific rank, with a view to the formulation of an *Opinion* appropriate to each of the various circumstances in which this problem arises. In accordance with these instructions, he had held extensive discussions on this subject with leading specialists in various parts of the world. Very helpful suggestions had been received from two specialist groups, namely the American Committee on Entomological Nomenclature and the Joint Committee on Zoological Nomenclature for Paleontology in America, while among individual specialists he was particularly indebted to Dr. Charles L. Remington (U.S.A.). Valuable help had been rendered also by Professor Carlos G. Aguayo (Cuba), Professor J. C. Faure (Union of South Africa), Professor E. Gorton Linsley (U.S.A.), Dr. H. K. Munro (Union of South Africa), Mr. N. D. Riley (United Kingdom), Dr. Curtis W. Sabrosky (U.S.A.), Dr. G. van Son (Union of South Africa) and Dr. Roger Verity (Italy), either through papers published by these authors or through correspondence. It was in the light of these and other consultations that, in collaboration with his wife, he had prepared the Report called for by the Commission at its Lisbon meeting, which he now submitted as Commission Paper I.C.(48)9. For the reasons explained in that Report, he did not consider that it would be practicable to deal with this complicated subject by way of an *Opinion*, nor would it, in his view, be correct to attempt to do so. If the matter was to be dealt with at all—and he considered it important that it should be dealt with, in view of the wide diversity of practice which existed at the present time—the proper (and the only proper) way to proceed would, in his view, be to invite the Congress to make express provision in the *Règles*. Recommendations to this end were included in the Report which he had submitted.

Continuing, THE ACTING PRESIDENT said that there was clearly not time for the Commission to examine the Report at the present meeting. It would be helpful, however, if, before the Commission adjourned, they could indicate their general attitude on the question of the procedure to be followed in dealing with the questions raised in the Report.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

- (1) that in view of the importance of the question of the status to be accorded to names proposed for infra-subspecific forms, the long period during which this matter had been under consideration and the need for securing uniformity in this field of zoological nomenclature, every effort should be made to secure the approval of the present Congress for the insertion in the *Règles* of provisions dealing with this subject ;
- (2) that the Report submitted by the Secretary (Commission Paper I.C.(48)9) should be placed on the Agenda of their next meeting for consideration as the first item.

**Fifth Meeting of
the Commission
during its Paris
Session : time
appointed**

15. THE COMMISSION agreed :—

to adjourn until 1430 hours on the afternoon of the same day.

(The Commission thereupon adjourned at 1220 hours.)

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION on ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

*Session held during the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology,
Paris, 21st-27th July, 1948*

CONCLUSIONS of the Fifth Meeting held at the Sorbonne in the Amphithéâtre Louis-Liard on Thursday, 22nd July 1948, at 1430 hours.

PRESENT :

Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom) (*Acting President*)
 Professor H. Boschma (Netherlands)
 Professor J. Chester Bradley (U.S.A.)
 Professor L. di Caporiacco (Italy)
 Professor Harold Kirby (U.S.A.)
 Professor Z. P. Metcalf (U.S.A.)
 Mr. N. D. Riley (United Kingdom)
 Professor R. Spärck (Denmark)
 Professor V. van Straelen (Belgium)
 Professor Robert L. Usinger (U.S.A.)

The following were also present :

Dr. E. A. Chapin (U.S.A.)
 Mr. C. F. dos Passos (U.S.A.)
 Dr. Ellsworth C. Dougherty (U.S.A.)
 Professor E. R. Hall (U.S.A.)
 Dr. Henning Lemche (Denmark)

Mrs. M. F. W. Hemming, *Personal Assistant to the Secretary*
 Miss J. H. Shorey, *Acting Documents Officer*

Status of names proposed for forms of less than subspecific rank : further consideration
(Previous reference : Paris Session, 4th Meeting, Conclusion 14)

1. THE COMMISSION resumed their consideration of the Report on the status of names proposed for forms of less than subspecific rank submitted by the Secretary to the Commission (Commission Paper I.C.(48)9), to which preliminary consideration had been given at their previous meeting. In this Report Commissioner Francis Hemming pointed out that the lowest taxonomic category recognised in the *Règles* was the "subspecies." There was considerable diversity of view regarding the way in which this expression should be interpreted in this context, some zoologists holding that this expression should be understood to have in the *Règles* the meaning commonly attached to it by taxonomists, while others argued that in the *Règles* this expression covers, or should cover, every infra-specific category and not merely populations which differ constantly from one another within a given species. The lack of guidance in the *Règles* on this question had led to much confusion and diversity of

practice ; it was essential therefore that the Congress should agree to insert words in the *Règles* to make it clear which of the two opposing interpretations was correct.

For those zoologists who were primarily concerned with the species problem and the variation of populations within a species, there was no need for names to be given to seasonal forms and other minority elements. Indeed, from the standpoint of this group of zoologists, the giving of names to minority elements was open to strong objection, if those names possessed, or were to possess, a status co-ordinate with that of the names of subspecies and species, for in that event these zoologists would need to keep records of the thousands of names involved, in case it might be found that a name so given was the oldest available name for some subspecies or species which had not hitherto been named or which had no valid name and to ensure that names given to subspecies and species were not homonyms of names given to forms of infra-subspecific rank. On the other hand, there was a considerable body of zoologists, especially in certain groups (e.g. in some of the Orders of the Class Insecta), who were particularly interested in the study of infra-subspecific forms (seasonal, sexual, dimorphic) and individual aberrations. For this group of workers it was essential that protection should be given in the *Règles* to names proposed for infra-subspecific forms, since otherwise there would be nothing to ensure that the same form was always denoted by the same name (Law of Priority) or that the same name was always used to denote the same form (Law of Homonymy). In such circumstances, inter-communication and mutual understanding in this branch of zoology would be seriously handicapped.

It was clear therefore that no solution of the present problem would be acceptable which denied to the names of infra-subspecific units the rights conferred by the Law of Priority or excluded such names from the scope of the Law of Homonymy. It was equally clear that no solution would be acceptable which granted an absolute parity to names bestowed upon infra-subspecific forms with names bestowed upon subspecies and species. The scheme embodied in the Report was designed to meet the practical needs both of those zoologists whose requirements were such that they should have at their disposal names for taxonomic units of infra-subspecific rank and also of those zoologists for whom there was no such need.

The first essential of any scheme designed to meet this twofold need was that the *Règles* should recognise two categories of name below the category " specific name," namely " subspecific name " and " infra-subspecific name," and

should give a clear definition of the meaning to be applied to each of these categories. It was suggested that for this purpose the *Règles* should define the expressions "subspecies" and "infra-subspecific form" and should provide means for determining to which of the above categories a given name should be regarded as belonging. The criterion to be adopted in applying those definitions must be objective, and it was suggested that it should depend upon the terms in which a given name was originally published. It was not possible to devise a scheme which would apply satisfactorily both to names published before the introduction of the scheme and to names published after that date, for any such scheme would be either too rigorous for names published in the earlier of these periods or insufficiently rigorous for those published in the later period. It was therefore suggested that the Congress should adopt the procedure followed for the amendment of Article 25 at Budapest and that two standards should be established, the first to apply to names published before the introduction of the scheme, the second to names published after that date. The first of these standards would be less rigorous than the second, and would admit to subspecific status a larger number of names than would the second. It was suggested also that, as in the case of the amendment of Article 25, a period of grace should be allowed before the more rigorous standard became operative. The Laws of Priority and Homonymy would apply both to names originally published as the names of subspecies and species and also to names originally published as the names of infra-subspecific forms, but these Laws would apply separately within each category, the two categories being separated from each other by a provision that, while within each category every name would be co-ordinate with every other name, a name in one category would not be co-ordinate with a name in the other. The scheme provided means for the elevation of a name published for an infra-subspecific form to be the name of a subspecies or species and for the relegation of a name published for a subspecies or species to be the name of a form of infra-subspecific rank; in the first of these cases the name would take priority only as from the date of being elevated and would be attributed to the author by whom it was so elevated, while in the second of these cases the name would retain its original priority and would be attributed to its original author. Proposals were also submitted for regulating the way in which names of either category should be designated on being first published as such and the way in which, after publication, names belonging to either category should be cited. Finally, the scheme proposed that special powers

should be conferred upon the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to establish, at the request of specialists, technical designations to be used to the exclusion of all other terms to denote parallel forms occurring in allied species or their subspecies.

A general discussion took place, in the course of which the following points were raised :—

(a) It was an essential feature of any scheme under which the nomenclature of subspecies and that of infra-subspecific forms was subjected to different sets of rules that a clear definition should be given to each of these expressions. The Report proposed that, for nomenclatorial purposes, the expression "subspecies" should be defined as "a geographical, ecological or other population within a species which differs constantly from another such population within the same species." Was this definition sufficiently embracing or should it be expanded to make it clear that the expression "or other" covered populations consisting largely, though not wholly, of a form arising from a mutation? It was generally thought that considerable difficulties would arise if express mention were to be made of populations arising from mutations in the definition of "subspecies" owing to the fact that in many cases a subjective judgment was involved in determining whether a given population had arisen in this way. It was felt therefore that it would be preferable to make no express mention of populations arising from mutations, but by leaving in the definition the words "or other," to make it possible in clear cases to bring a name given to such a population within the definition of the name of a "subspecies." Examples of the kind of case here contemplated were provided by insular faunas where it was sometimes found that a mutant form had become the sole, or virtually the sole, representative of a given species. The definition would be improved if it were reworded so as to stress the fact that its central feature was that a subspecies was a population which differed from other populations within the species, the words "geographical, ecological or other" being inserted in the definition in such a way as not to obscure this central feature.

(b) In the course of the foregoing discussion, the view was generally expressed that, if (as was ultimately agreed) no express reference to mutants were to be made in the definition of "subspecies," the reference to such forms in the definition of "infra-subspecific form" suggested in the Report should be deleted.

It would then be possible for the names given to mutant forms to be treated on their merits. If such a form constituted a population, the name given to it would rank as the name given to a subspecies, but, where such a form did not constitute a population, a name given to it would rank as a name given to a form of infra-subspecific rank.

- (c) There were many populations which fully deserved to be regarded as constituting subspecies, in which, however, a minority of the individuals constituting the population concerned did not exhibit the characters which differentiated the remainder of the population from other populations within the species. It would be a mistake, therefore, to make it a condition that, in order that a name given to a population should qualify for treatment for nomenclatorial purposes as a name given to a subspecies, the population named should differ "constantly" from other populations within the species. It was generally agreed that the word "constantly" should be deleted from the proposed definition of "subspecies."
- (d) It was suggested in discussion that words should be inserted in the definition of "subspecies" which would exclude from the status of names of subspecies names given to populations which were unknown in a state of nature and had only been brought into existence in laboratory conditions. Would it not be possible to insert some such qualifying phrase as "natural" or "in nature"? Against this view it was argued that it would be unscientific, because illogical, to stigmatise as "unnatural" a population created in laboratory conditions. The laboratory worker could to some extent control the forces of nature but he was not a magician and he was powerless to produce any effect that was contrary to nature. It was agreed that the suggestion referred to above should not be pursued.
- (e) Some discussion took place regarding the rules to be adopted governing the elevation of a name from the category of "names of infra-subspecific forms" to the category of "names of subspecies." The question was asked whether it would not be possible to permit a name so elevated to retain its original priority and to be referred to its original author. Was it essential that on being so elevated a name should be treated as a new name in the realm into which it had been translated? It was pointed out that this particular provision was a vital feature

of the scheme, for it was this provision alone which made it possible for the students of species and subspecies to ignore the thousands of names given to forms of infra-subspecific rank. If this provision were to be abandoned, the scheme would be deprived of a great part of its value, for every author who described a new species or subspecies would have to take account of every name given to a form of infra-subspecific rank in the genus concerned, if he were to make sure that the name selected by himself for his new species or subspecies should not be liable to be rejected as a junior homonym if ever some name consisting of the same word which had already been given to a form of infra-subspecific rank of some species or subspecies in that genus were to be elevated to be the name of a subspecies or species.

- (f) The scheme, as submitted in the Report, provided for the application within their own sphere to the names of forms of infra-subspecific rank of the Articles in the *Règles* relating to the names of species and subspecies. This was clearly an essential feature of the scheme but care would need to be taken by the jurists to ensure that this provision was not accidentally applied to Articles which by their nature were inapplicable to the names of forms of infra-subspecific rank, for example, Article 17 (which relates to the manner in which subspecific names are to be cited). Another example would be provided by the new Article, if approved, which it had been suggested should be added to the *Règles*, prescribing that the trivial name of the nominotypical subspecies of a species having two or more subspecies should consist of the same word as the trivial name of the species itself.
- (g) The recognition of a new category ("infra-subspecific name") in the hierarchy of names would involve a consequential addition to Article 2.
- (h) The scheme submitted in the Report contemplated the express grant to forms of infra-subspecific rank of rights under the Laws of Priority and Homonymy as between one another, though not as between the name of such a form and the name of a species or subspecies. Appropriate words would need to be added to Article 25 to cover this point. A corresponding provision would have to be inserted in Article 35 (Law of Homonymy).

(Later reference:
Paris Session,
7th Meeting,
Conclusion 2)

(Previous reference:
Paris Session,
4th Meeting,
Conclusion 7)

(i) At an earlier meeting it had been agreed to recommend to the Congress that a *Recommandation* should be added to Proviso (c)(1) to Article 25 laying down an ideal standard of procedure to be followed by authors when giving names to new taxonomic units. The introduction into the *Règles* of a new category (the category "infra-subspecific name") would necessitate a corresponding addition to the *Recommandation* referred to above. This should be to the effect that a description of a new form of infra-subspecific rank should include not only an absolute, but also a comparative, description of the form in question, that is, it should contain also particulars of the characters which distinguish that form from some previously described form of infra-subspecific rank in the same species or, if there was no known form with which such a comparison could be made, the characters which distinguish the new form from the general population of the species or subspecies concerned.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

- (1) that the *Règles* should be modified and extended in accordance with the principles, and in the manner specified in (2) to (15) below, to give effect, subject to certain minor amendments agreed upon during the preceding discussion, to the proposals for dealing with the problem of names proposed for taxonomic units of less than specific rank set forth in the Report submitted by the Secretary to the Commission as Commission Paper I.C.(48)9;
- (2) that, as a first step to the regulation of names given to taxonomic units of less than specific rank, words should be inserted in the *Règles* defining the expression "subspecific name" and recognising and defining the expression "infra-subspecific name" ;
- (3) that, as used in connection with the foregoing categories of name, the expressions "subspecies" and "infra-subspecific form" shall have the meanings specified below :—

<i>Expression</i>	<i>Definition of expression</i>
"Subspecies" ...	A population (e.g., geographical, ecological) within a species which differs from any other such population within the same species.

“ Infra-subspecific form ” Any form of a species other than a subspecies as defined above (e.g. seasonal forms and minority elements of all kinds within a species, such as sexual forms, transition forms, aberrations, etc.) ;

- (4) that, having regard to the fact that it was not possible to devise provisions for determining whether a trivial name published for a taxonomic unit of less than specific rank was to be regarded as the trivial name of a subspecies or of an infra-subspecific form, which would be equally appropriate for trivial names published before the introduction of the new scheme and for names published after its introduction, the *Règles* should provide two standards by which such names might acquire status as subspecific trivial names, one, more lenient, to be applied to names already published, the other, more rigorous, to be applied to names published in the future ;
- (5) that, in view of the need for giving adequate notice to zoologists of the new provisions before they became operative, the point of time to be specified in the *Règles* as that from which the more rigorous of the standards referred to in (4) above should be applicable should be midnight G.M.T. (Greenwich Mean Time), 31st December, 1950/1st January, 1951 ;
- (6) that, in order to ensure against the risk that names intended by their authors to be the trivial names of subspecies might fail to acquire status as such on account of some technical nomenclatorial reason, care should be taken to avoid prescribing unduly detailed conditions to be complied with by names, in order that, on being first published, they should acquire the status of a trivial name of a subspecies and not merely that of a trivial name of an infra-subspecific form ; that the conditions to be prescribed should therefore represent a minimum standard ; but that, in order to provide a guide to the highest standard to be aimed at, *Recommendations* prescribing that standard should be added to the relevant new provisions of the *Règles* ;
- (7) that the criterion to be applied for determining whether a given trivial name was to be regarded as the trivial name of a subspecies or as the trivial name of an infra-subspecific form should be the

objective standard provided by the terms in which the name in question was originally published, and that the *Règles* should accordingly provide :—

(a) that any trivial name published, *prior to the point of time specified in (5) above*, as the trivial name of a taxonomic unit of less than specific rank should be deemed to have been published as the name of a subspecies or, as the case may be, of an infra-subspecific form in accordance with the following rules :—

(i) *as the trivial name of a subspecies*, when, at the time of the original publication of the name, the author concerned either (1) clearly indicated that he regarded the taxonomic unit named as of subspecific rank or (2) did not clearly indicate the status attributed by him to the unit so named, that is to say, whether he regarded it as being a subspecies or as being an infra-subspecific form ;

(ii) *as the trivial name of an infra-subspecific form*, only when, at the time of the original publication of the name, the author concerned expressly indicated that he regarded the taxonomic unit so named as being an infra-subspecific form ;

(b) that any trivial name published, *after the point of time specified in (5) above*, as the trivial name of a taxonomic unit of less than specific rank should be deemed to have been published as the name of a subspecies or, as the case may be, of an infra-subspecific form in accordance with the following rules :—

(i) *as the trivial name of a subspecies*, only when, at the time of the original publication of the name, the author concerned clearly indicated that he regarded the taxonomic unit so named as being a subspecies ;

(ii) *as the trivial name of an infra-subspecific form*, in all cases where, at the time of the original publication of the name, the author concerned either expressly indicated that he regarded the taxonomic unit so named as being an infra-subspecific form or, if he did

not so indicate the status of the taxonomic unit concerned, where he failed to indicate clearly that he regarded that unit as being of subspecific rank;

(8) that the *Recommandations* referred to in (6) above should strongly recommend:—

(a) that an author, when publishing a trivial name for a previously unnamed subspecies, should cite that name in a trinominal combination (consisting of (1) the generic name, (2) the specific trivial name, and (3) the subspecific trivial name) and should add, immediately after the subspecific trivial name, the expression "ssp. n." or some equivalent expression, thereby indicating both that the name is a new name and that it is intended to apply to a subspecies;

(b) that an author, when publishing a trivial name for a previously unnamed infra-subspecific form, should (1) cite the specific name (consisting of a binominal combination of the generic name and the specific trivial name) of the species concerned or, if the form is described as a form of a subspecies only, the name of that subspecies (consisting of a trinominal combination of the generic name and the specific and subspecific trivial names of the subspecies concerned), (2) insert after the specific or subspecific trivial name, as the case may be, a comma followed by an expression indicating the status attributed to the form in question (e.g. an expression such as "form. vern.", "♀-form," or "ab."), and (3) add the name of the new infra-subspecific form, followed by the expression "form. n." or some equivalent expression, thereby indicating both that the name is a new name and that it is intended to apply to an infra-subspecific form;

(9) that a clear distinction should be drawn in the *Règles* between the status of a name originally published as the trivial name of a subspecies or species and that of a name originally published as the trivial name of an infra-subspecific form, and therefore that provisions should be inserted to secure:—

- (a) that, while the Law of Priority (Article 25) and the Law of Homonymy (Articles 35 and 36) apply both to the trivial names of sub-species and species on the one hand and to the trivial names of infra-subspecific forms on the other hand, those Laws apply separately to each of these two categories of names, which thus constitute self-contained and mutually independent sectors of nomenclature ;
- (b) that (as at present) the trivial names of subspecies should be co-ordinate with the trivial names of species and *vice versa* ;
- (c) that the trivial name given to any infra-subspecific form be co-ordinate with the trivial names given to all other infra-subspecific forms but not with the trivial names given to subspecies and species ;
- (d) that a trivial name originally published as the trivial name of an infra-subspecific form may be elevated to the status of a subspecific trivial name or of a specific trivial name by a subsequent reviser and in that event shall rank in its new status for purposes of priority as from the date on which it was so elevated and shall be attributed to the author by whom it was so elevated ;
- (e) that, for the purposes of (d) above, an author is to be deemed to have elevated to the status of a subspecific or specific trivial name a name originally published as the trivial name of an infra-subspecific form if he is the first author expressly to state that he is so doing or to make it clear that he regards the animal in question as representing a subspecies or species instead of an infra-subspecific form, the mere citation of the name in question in trinominal form, if unaccompanied by further evidence, not constituting evidence of elevation ;
- (f) that, where a name, originally published as the trivial name of an infra-subspecific form, is elevated to the status of a trivial name of a subspecies or species by a subsequent reviser, acting under (d) above, and some other author does not recognise the taxonomic validity of the action taken by

the previous reviser and in consequence continues to regard the animal concerned as representative not of a subspecies or species but of an infra-subspecific form, the trivial name of that organism shall, for any such author, retain its original priority and shall be attributed to its original author ;

- (g) that, where an animal which, when originally named, was treated as representing a subspecies or species, is treated by a subsequent reviser as representing a taxonomic unit of infra-subspecific rank, the trivial name originally given to that animal shall continue to be applied to it and shall in its new status retain its original priority and be attributed to its original author ;
- (10) that, in order to obtain as high a degree of clarity as possible, a *Recommandation* should be added to the provisions to be inserted in the *Règles* to give effect to (9)(d) above, urging that, when an author is the first author to treat as representing a subspecies or species an animal which, when originally named, was treated as representing an infra-subspecific form, and in so doing is the first author to elevate the name originally published for that animal to the status of a subspecific or specific trivial name, that author should expressly state that he is so doing and should, as soon as possible thereafter, notify his action to a recording serial such as the *Zoological Record*, either by sending a marked copy of the paper concerned or otherwise ;
- (11) that a provision should be inserted in the *Règles* prescribing that, when an author cites the name of an infra-subspecific form, he should (a) cite the specific name (consisting of a binominal combination of the generic name and the specific trivial name) of the species concerned or, if the form is treated as a form of a subspecies only and not of the species as a whole, the name of that subspecies (consisting of the trinominal combination of the generic name and the specific and subspecific trivial names of the subspecies concerned), (b) insert after the specific or subspecific trivial name, as the case may be, a comma followed by an expression indicating the status attributed to the form in question (e.g. an expression such as "form. vern.", "♀-form," or "ab.") and (3) add the name of the infra-subspecific form ;

(12) that, in view of the decision to recognise and define the new nomenclatorial category "infra-sub-specific name," words should be inserted in Article 2 providing:—

(a) that, where an infra-subspecific form is cited in relation to a species, the scientific designation of that form is a qualified trinomial, having regard to the fact that a descriptive designation is interpolated between the trivial name of the species and the trivial name of the infra-subspecific form, and thus differs from the unqualified trinomial constituted by the scientific designation of a subspecies;

(b) that, where an infra-subspecific form is cited in relation to a subspecies, the scientific designation of that form is a qualified quadrinomial;

(13) that, having regard (a) to the decision taken at the meeting of the Commission noted in the margin to insert a *Recommandation* to Proviso (c)(1) to Article 25, laying down the ideal procedure to be followed by authors when naming new taxonomic units, and (b) to the present decision to recognise and define the new nomenclatorial category "infra-subspecific name," words should be added to the *Recommandation* referred to above urging every author, when drawing up a description of an infra-subspecific form not only to give an absolute description of that form, but also to indicate the characters which distinguish that form from some previously described infra-subspecific form in the same species or, if there is no known form with which such a comparison could be made, the characters which distinguish the new form from the general population of the species or subspecies concerned;

(14) that a provision or provisions should be inserted in the *Règles* applying to the trivial names of infra-subspecific forms the provisions in the *Règles* relating to the trivial names of species and subspecies, other than those provisions, which, having regard to recommendations (1) to (13) above, it would be inappropriate so to apply;

(15) that, in order to prevent the confusion which might arise (and to remove the confusion which in certain instances had already arisen) when

(Previous reference:
Paris Session,
4th Meeting,
Conclusion 7)

different trivial names were applied to parallel infra-subspecific forms occurring in two or more allied species or their subspecies, provisions should be inserted in the *Règles* :—

- (a) empowering the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, on the application of specialists in the groups concerned, to use their plenary powers to establish technical designations to be applied to such parallel infra-subspecific forms, such designations to be exempt from invalidation under the Law of Homonymy and :—
 - (i) to consist of Latin or Latinised words or words treated as such ; and
 - (ii) to comply with the provisions in the *Règles* relating to the formation, derivation and orthography of specific and subspecific trivial names ;
- (b) prescribing that, where a given term is specified under the foregoing procedure to be the technical designation of a parallel infra-subspecific form occurring in two or more allied species, the term so specified shall have absolute priority over :—
 - (i) any trivial name which may already have been given to that form in any of the species concerned, and over
 - (ii) any other use of the same word as the name of any other infra-subspecific form of any species in the same genus or genera.

**Article 2 :
insertion of
reference to
category "subgenus"**

2. In the course of the discussion recorded in Conclusion 1 above relating to the addition required to be made to Article 2 of the *Règles* consequent upon the recognition for nomenclatorial purposes of the new nomenclatorial category "infra-subspecific name," attention was drawn to the fact that the drafting of Article 2 was defective and required amendment. For although that Article purported to give a general indication of the nature of the scientific designation applicable to each of the taxonomic categories recognised for nomenclatorial purposes, it failed to make it clear that, as the category "subgenus" was an optional category, a subgeneric name, when used, was to be ignored in calculating the number of words of which a specific or subspecific name was composed. It was necessary that this ambiguity should now be removed.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend:—

that words should be inserted in Article 2 to indicate:—

that, as the subgenus is an optional category, the name of a subgenus, when used, is not to be taken into account when determining the number of words comprised in the scientific designation of species and subspecies and therefore that the interpolation of a subgeneric name between the generic name and the specific trivial name of a species does not, in the case of the name of a species, convert that name from a binomial into a trinomial or, in the case of the name of a subspecies, convert that name from a trinomial into a quadrinomial.

**Articles 35 and 36 :
problem of specific
homonyms :
preliminary
consideration**

3. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a memorandum containing proposals for the amendment of the provisions of Articles 35 and 36 in relation to specific homonyms submitted by the Secretary to the Commission as Commission Paper I.C.(48)8.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT said the question of the meaning of the provisions of the *Règles* in regard to specific homonymy had first been officially placed before the Commission by the late Professor T. D. A. Cockerell in 1937. The particular case then submitted involved the question of whether a trivial name replaced as a secondary homonym should be revived if the union of genera which had created the secondary homonymy was no longer recognised (cf. paragraphs 3 and 4 of Paper I.C.(48)8). Owing to his pre-occupation at that time with the reorganisation of the Secretariat of the Commission and other matters, the Secretary to the Commission had invited President Jordan to undertake, on his behalf, a preliminary sounding of the views of the Commissioners on the question raised by Professor Cockerell. This consultation had been completed by the summer of 1939 but further progress in the matter had been interrupted by the outbreak of war in Europe in September of that year and it had not been until 1943 that it had been possible to resume work on this problem. Since that date, he (the Acting President), in his capacity of Secretary to the Commission, had given a great deal of further consideration to the matter and had received a large volume of correspondence from many different sources. In this correspondence a number of extremely helpful contributions had been received. In the first place he desired to acknowledge the valuable analysis of the problem made by Dr. Richard E. Blackwelder (United States National Museum, Washington, D.C.). Interesting and suggestive

points had been raised also by: Dr. Joshua L. Baily, Jr. (San Diego, Cal.); Dr. Ellsworth C. Dougherty (University of California); Professor Carl L. Hubbs (University of Michigan); Dr. J. Brookes Knight (United States National Museum, Washington, D.C.); Dr. E. W. Price (U.S. Bureau of Animal Husbandry); Professor Dr. Rudolf Richter (Senckenberg Institution, Frankfurt, Germany); Dr. Hobart M. Smith (University of Rochester, N.Y.). In addition, he had had extensive personal discussions with leading specialists in many countries. The visit which he had been able to pay to the United States and Canada at the end of 1947 had been of particular value in providing extensive opportunities for discussions both with organised groups of specialists and with individual workers in particular parts of the Animal Kingdom. Finally, he wished to express his grateful thanks to his wife who had worked over the whole of the material and had taken an active part in the formulation of the document now before the Commission.

Continuing, THE ACTING PRESIDENT said that from the communications which he had received and the consultations which he had held, two things had become evident: first, that the general opinion and practice of zoologists in the treatment of so-called secondary homonyms was developing and changing, second, that the original plan that the Commission should confine itself to giving an authoritative interpretation of the existing text of Articles 35 and 36 was no longer adequate to the situation and that a more radical treatment of the whole problem was needed. The need for a fresh approach was evident, both because a closer examination of Articles 35 and 36 disclosed a number of gaps and ambiguities and failed to provide answers to a number of essential questions and also because the preliminary consultations conducted by President Jordan had brought to light a fundamental confusion of two distinct questions: first, what the *Règles*, as they stand, really mean, and, second, what zoologists in general would like them to mean, which might be, and in this particular case apparently was, entirely different. This confusion no doubt arose from the unduly defeatist attitude then prevalent towards the possibility of amending the *Règles* and the conviction that the only way of securing the desired end was to persuade the International Commission to render an *Opinion* interpreting the existing provisions of the *Règles* in the desired sense, irrespective of the normal meaning of the words actually used in the Articles concerned. Such a procedure could not be regarded as satisfactory or as likely to promote the general respect and adherence which the *Règles* should command. If zoologists in general were not

satisfied with the provisions of the *Règles* as they stood, it would be much better for the provisions concerned to be amended in the direction required, than for the Commission—or individual workers—to try to read into the existing words a meaning which was obviously not there at present.

The gaps and ambiguities in Articles 35 and 36 showed very clearly that the problem of specific homonymy was much more complex than the authors of the *Règles* had realised, and that any satisfactory regulation of this subject would call for provisions both more precise and more comprehensive than those embodied in the present Articles. In the paper (I.C.(48)8) which he (the Acting President) had submitted to the Commission, he had taken, as a basis of discussion, the schematic presentation of the eight major types of specific homonym which had recently been put forward by Dr. Richard Blackwelder. In order to weigh the relative advantages of the various possible solutions of the problem presented by specific homonymy, it was necessary carefully to examine the various circumstances in which a situation of homonymy might arise: In the first of the cases to be considered—Case "A"—a specific trivial name (*albus*) was published for two different species, each of which at the time that this trivial name was applied to it was referred to the genus "X"; in this case it was assumed that the two species were still regarded by all taxonomists as congeneric. In this case, therefore, a situation of unequivocal homonymy existed from the date on which the specific trivial name *albus* was published for the second of the two species concerned. Case "B" was exactly similar to Case "A," except that at some date subsequent to the publication of the specific trivial name *albus* for the second species, either that species or the other species bearing the same specific trivial name had been removed on taxonomic grounds to another genus (genus "Y"). In Case "C" the first of the species to be described under the specific trivial name *albus* had been removed (on taxonomic grounds) from the genus "X," before the date of the description in genus "X" of the second species bearing the same trivial name (*albus*). In Case "D," the two species bearing the same trivial name (*albus*) were originally described in different genera, but before the description in genus "X" of the later of the two species to be described, the species bearing the older trivial name had been transferred to genus "X" (from genus "Y"), thus producing unquestionable homonymy. Case "E" was similar to Case "D," except that the transfer to the genus "X" of the species bearing the older trivial name took place after the date of the description in that genus of the species bearing the later-published trivial name. Cases "F," "G" and

"H" were similar to Cases "D" and "E," except that the transfer to genus "X" of the species bearing the older trivial name was temporary; in Case "F" entirely prior to, in Case "G" entirely subsequent to, and in Case "H" partly before, and partly after, the description in that genus of the second of the species to be published with the trivial name *albus*.

The Acting President went on to say that discussions of the problem of homonyms, both past and recent, had disclosed wide divergences of views and suggested that it was not likely to be possible to find any solution which would give complete satisfaction to everyone. The solution to be aimed at must satisfy, to as high a degree as possible, a number of different, and, in part, mutually inconsistent, requirements. It was the difference in weighting attributed to these conflicting *desiderata*, rather than a difference in views on the *desiderata* themselves, that was responsible for the widely divergent proposals advocated in different quarters. The principal *desiderata* which any satisfactory solution must aim to supply to the highest degree mutually compatible with one another were six in number: (1) the avoidance of the confusion which would arise if the same name were used for two different species of animals; (2) the avoidance of the confusion which would arise if one species of animal were known by two different names; (3) the avoidance of the need for unnecessary time-consuming researches into early literature; (4) the avoidance of any subjective element in the interpretation of the *Règles*, so that the trivial name which they prescribe may be independent of the taxonomic views of individual workers; (5) the avoidance of unnecessary changes in trivial names now in use; (6) the avoidance of the risk of names being unnecessarily replaced through deliberate misuse of the provisions of the *Règles*.

Although there was no mention of it in the *Règles*, a distinction had been drawn by many zoologists between *primary* homonyms on the one hand and *secondary* homonyms on the other. *Primary homonyms* were pairs of specific names consisting of combinations of a generic name and a specific trivial name identical at the time of their original publication. *Secondary homonyms* were all other kinds, namely pairs of identical specific trivial names which were not originally published in combination with the same generic name but subsequently came to be used in combination with the same generic name through the transfer of one or both of the species concerned to another genus or through the union of two or more genera. Of the eight types of homonym to which he had referred a few moments earlier, Cases

"A," "B," and "C" were examples of primary homonyms, while Cases "D," "E," "F," "G," and "H" were examples of secondary homonyms.

Every zoologist would agree that, where in his judgment homonymy currently existed (e.g. in Cases "A," "D," and "E") the later published of the two identical trivial names must certainly be replaced. But there was no general agreement as to what a zoologist should do in those cases where there had at one time been homonymy but in his judgment no homonymy currently exists. The main issues on which opinions (and practice) differed were the following:—

- (1) Should a *primary homonym* be replaced whenever it was discovered, or only when the condition of homonymy was considered still to exist (Case "A") but not otherwise (Cases "B" and "C")?
- (2) Should a *secondary homonym* be replaced whenever it was discovered, or only when the condition of homonymy was considered still to exist (Cases "D" and "E") but not otherwise (Cases "F," "G," and "H")?
- (3) If a *primary homonym* had been replaced because a condition of homonymy existed at that time, should the original name be restored later when, through the transfer of one or both of the species to another genus (or other genera) or through the subdivision of the original genus into two or more genera, the condition of homonymy was considered no longer to exist?
- (4) If a *secondary homonym* had been replaced because a condition of homonymy was considered to exist at that time, should the original name be restored later when, through the further transfer of one or both of the species to another genus (or other genera) or through the subdivision of the genus in which the homonymy occurred into two or more genera, the condition of homonymy was considered no longer to exist?

The various permutations and combinations of possible answers to these questions, the Acting President pointed out, provided more than a dozen possible solutions. Of these, five only had been put forward or had received any appreciable support from zoologists. These were:—

Proposal (I). The permanent replacement of *all* homonyms whenever they were discovered (i.e. the rejection and permanent replacement of the later published of the pair of trivial names consisting of the

word *albus* in Cases "A," "B," "C," "D," "E," "F," "G," and "H," whenever homonymy was discovered).

Proposal (II). The permanent replacement of all *primary* homonyms whenever discovered, combined with the temporary replacement of *secondary* homonyms only if discovered when, and for the period during which, homonymy was considered to exist (i.e. the rejection and permanent replacement of the later published of the two identical trivial names in Cases "A," "B," and "C," whenever discovered, and the temporary replacement of the later published of the two identical trivial names if homonymy was discovered during the period in which it was considered to exist, with the restoration of that trivial name when the condition of homonymy was thought no longer to exist as in Cases "G" and "H"). In Cases "D" and "E," the later published identical trivial name must necessarily be replaced after the dates on which the two species were transferred to the same genus, for in those cases the condition of homonymy was assumed to persist. In Case "F" there was no need at any stage to replace the later published of the two trivial names.

Proposal (III). The temporary replacement of both primary and secondary homonyms if discovered when, and for the period during which a condition of homonymy was considered to exist. This proposal was the same as *Proposal (II)*, except that under it the later published of the two identical trivial names would not have to be replaced permanently in Case "B" but only during the period in which the condition of homonymy was considered to exist. It would not have to be replaced at all unless the homonymy were discovered during those years. In Case "C" the later published of the two identical trivial names would not have to be replaced at all under this *Proposal*.

Proposal (IV). The permanent replacement of both primary and secondary homonyms, but only if discovered during the period in which a condition of homonymy was considered to exist. This *Proposal* differed from *Proposal (I)* only by reason of the fact that the replacement of both primary and secondary homonyms would take place only if these were discovered during the period in which the condition of homonymy was considered still to exist.

Proposal (V). The permanent replacement of primary homonyms whenever discovered, combined with the permanent replacement of secondary homonyms only if these were discovered during the period in

which the condition of homonymy was considered still to exist. This Proposal differed from Proposal (II) only by reason of the fact that the replacement of secondary homonyms, whenever it took place, was to be permanent.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT then said that he had listed fully the merits and demerits of each of these proposals in paragraphs 18 to 27 of the paper which he had submitted (Commission Paper I.C.(48)8) and, after setting the one against the other, had come to the conclusion that the last of these proposals was the one to be preferred, offering, as it did, in his view, the least disadvantages or disadvantages which were most amenable to remedy by other means. He asked the Commission, before proceeding further, to consider very carefully the various arguments in favour of, or against, each of the five proposals which he had outlined and to decide which of them provided the best basis for an agreed solution.

IN THE DISCUSSION which ensued, general agreement was expressed with the view that the problem of specific homonymy could not be dealt with satisfactorily by means of an *Opinion* rendered by the Commission interpreting the existing provisions of Articles 35 and 36. What was needed was the substitution for those Articles of new Articles which would set out clearly and comprehensively whatever provisions might be agreed upon for regulating this question.

The Commission turned then to consider the relative merits and demerits of each of the five main proposals which had been outlined by the Acting President, particular attention being paid to the summary of the considerations on either side given in paragraphs 18 to 27 of Commission Paper I.C.(48)8. In the course of this discussion, the following views were expressed:—

- (a) *Proposal (I)* went much further than was either necessary or desirable, for it contemplated the rejection and replacement not only of trivial names which had been homonyms at the time when they were originally published or which were now regarded as homonyms, but also of every trivial name which, through carelessness, ignorance or any other cause, had ever been a homonym of some other trivial name (Cases "F," "G," and "H"). This proposal, if adopted, would cause unending trouble and confusion to the systematic worker who would need to be constantly on the watch to make sure that no author had amalgamated some genus with another and thus destroyed the validity of what had

previously been a perfectly valid name. Such workers would require to make a close study of the works not only of the best authors (as at present) but also of the worst authors, for it would be mostly in the works of such authors that the lumping of taxonomically valid genera into large omnibus genera would be likely to be found. Systematic workers would also have to extend their reading to educational and semi-popular works where the nomenclature used was often extremely faulty.

- (b) Whatever scheme was adopted, it should be such as to satisfy the second of the *desiderata* enunciated by the Acting President, namely that it should ensure that any given species should always have the same word as its valid trivial name, irrespective of the subjective view of taxonomists as to the genus to which that species should be referred. This consideration ruled out both *Proposal (II)* and *Proposal (III)*.
- (c) The choice before the Commission lay, therefore between *Proposal (IV)* and *Proposal (V)*. Both these proposals secured that every species should always have the same trivial name, whatever might be the subjective views of individual workers regarding the taxonomic relationship of one species with another. The two proposals differed from one another only by the treatment proposed to be accorded to primary homonyms which, under *Proposal (IV)*, would be liable to rejection and replacement on the same terms as secondary homonyms, whereas, under *Proposal (V)*, they would be permanently rejected whenever discovered. The distinction between primary and secondary homonyms which lay at the basis of *Proposal (V)* was concerned with the nomenclatorial problem of homonyms in the field of nominal species, whereas *Proposal (IV)* was directed solely to the taxonomic problem of homonyms in the field of taxonomic species. The advocates of *Proposal (IV)* argued that it was sufficient to secure that every currently recognised taxonomic species had a distinct name, and considered that it was of no importance whether two nominal species were originally described under the same name in the sense of the same binomial combination, since a reference to the original author and date of publication would avoid any confusion arising therefrom. These workers argued therefore that there was no need to replace a primary homo-

nym when the species concerned was no longer referred to the same genus as that containing the other species having an identical but earlier published trivial name. The Acting President said that he had given the most careful consideration to this proposal, which offered the advantage in some groups of reducing the number of cases in which changes of trivial names would be necessary. But, on the other hand, he was impressed by the fact that the name of the author and the date of publication did not form part of a zoological name and that it was extremely desirable that each nominal species should possess as its nomenclatorially valid specific name a binominal combination of a generic name and a specific trivial name that was unique, in the sense of not being shared with any other species. Moreover, he was impressed further by the fact that to abandon the distinction between primary and secondary homonyms would be to depart from the commonly accepted practice of zoologists. On balance, therefore, although in some cases *Proposal* (V) would involve changes in trivial names which would not be called for under *Proposal* (IV), he felt that it was to be preferred in the interests both of avoiding nomenclatorial (as contrasted with taxonomic) confusion and of securing continuity of practice. Both *Proposals* (IV) and (V) suffered from the disadvantage that they were open to abuse in the form of the deliberate creation of secondary homonyms by irresponsible or malicious revisers, but, if any such abuse were to be attempted, it could promptly be countered by the Commission employing their plenary powers to suppress for nomenclatorial purposes any book or paper in which the *Règles* were misused in this way.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

to adopt *Proposal* (V) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)8, namely the permanent replacement of primary homonyms whenever discovered, combined with the permanent replacement of secondary homonyms only if these were discovered during the period in which the condition of homonymy was considered still to exist, as the basis of the new provisions relating to specific homonymy to be recommended for insertion in the *Règles* in place of the existing Articles 35 and 36.

**Sixth Meeting of
the Commission
during its Paris
Session : time
appointed**

**4. On the proposal of the Acting President, THE
COMMISSION agreed :—**

to postpone their consideration of the detailed provisions required to give effect to the decision just taken in regard to the reform of the *Règles* in regard to specific homonymy until their next meeting, to be held the same afternoon at 1700 hours.

(*The Commission thereupon adjourned at 1620 hours.*)

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION on ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

*Session held during the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology,
Paris, 21st-27th July, 1948*

CONCLUSIONS of the Sixth Meeting held at the Sorbonne in the Amphithéâtre Louis-Liard on Thursday, 22nd July, 1948, at 1700 hours

PRESENT :

Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom) (*Acting President*)
 Professor H. Boschma (Netherlands)
 Professor J. Chester Bradley (U.S.A.)
 Professor L. di Caporiacco (Italy)
 Professor Harold Kirby (U.S.A.)
 Mr. N. D. Riley (United Kingdom)
 Professor R. Spärck (Denmark)
 Professor V. van Straelen (Belgium)
 Professor Robert L. Usinger (U.S.A.)

The following were also present :

Dr. E. A. Chapin (U.S.A.)
 Dr. Ellsworth C. Dougherty (U.S.A.)
 Dr. Henning Lemche (Denmark)

Mrs. M. F. W. Hemming, *Personal Assistant to the Secretary*
 Miss J. H. Shorey, *Acting Documents Officer*

**Articles 35 and 36 :
(problem of specific
homonymy) :
further
consideration**
(*Previous reference:
Paris Session,
5th Meeting,
Conclusion 3*)

1. THE ACTING PRESIDENT recalled that at the close of their last meeting the Commission had concluded the first part of their consideration of the problem of specific homonymy by agreeing to recommend the adoption of *Proposal (V)* in Commission Paper I.C.(48)8, namely the permanent replacement of primary homonyms whenever discovered, combined with the permanent replacement of secondary homonyms only if these were discovered during a period in which the condition of homonymy was considered still to exist, as the basis of the new provisions relating to specific homonymy to be inserted in the *Règles* in place of the existing Articles 35 and 36. It now remained for the Commission to consider the various detailed suggestions for giving effect to the foregoing decision set out in paragraphs 30 to 40 of Commission Paper I.C.(48)8 and for embodying in the *Règles* provisions relating to certain matters which were either omitted from, or were ambiguously or otherwise unsatisfactorily dealt with in, the existing text of Articles 35 and 36.

The following is a summary of the principal points which emerged in the ensuing discussion.

(A) *Need for the definition of the expressions "homonym," "primary homonym," and "secondary homonym":* It was generally agreed that, in view of the decision to introduce into the *Règles* a distinction between the treatment of a "primary homonym" and a "secondary homonym," it was essential that, as suggested by the Acting President in Commission Paper I.C.(48)8 (paragraph 31), clear definitions of these expressions should be inserted in the *Règles*. It was felt also that it would be useful to incorporate into the *Règles* a definition of the expression "homonym" in place of the definition of homonymy given in a footnote in the present text.

(B) *Scope of the definitions to be given to the expressions "primary homonym" and "secondary homonym":* The Acting President had suggested in Commission Paper I.C.(48)8 (paragraph 31) that, as proposed in paragraph 15 of that paper, the expression "primary homonyms" should be defined as "pairs of specific names consisting of identical combinations of generic and specific trivial names at the time of their original publication" and that the expression "secondary homonyms" should be defined as "pairs of identical specific trivial names which were not originally published in combination with the same generic name but which later came to be so combined through the transfer of one or both of the species concerned to another genus or through the union of two or more genera." These definitions had been restated in the singular in paragraph 41(7) of the same paper. The wording employed in these suggested definitions had been deliberately selected to cover two different classes of case, namely: (1) the case where two nominal species having the same specific trivial name were either originally published in, or were subsequently transferred to, the same genus; and (2) the case where two nominal species having the same specific trivial name were originally published in different genera but through the accident of an undetected condition of generic homonymy those two genera had the same name, and the case where two nominal species having the same specific trivial name were originally published in different genera, each having a different name, but later one or both of these nominal species were transferred to another genus (or other genera) which through the accident of an undetected condition of generic homonymy had the same generic name. Clearly, the first of these classes of case must be covered by the definitions to be adopted for primary and secondary homonyms respectively, but it was not so clear that the second

need be included in these definitions. The second class of case was not of great practical importance, in view of the fact that the number of occasions on which the particular situation there envisaged had actually arisen was relatively small. A provision of some sort should be included in the *Règles* to cover such cases, for otherwise authors encountering such cases would not know how to proceed. On balance, it was felt that this class of case should be covered by the definitions to be adopted for primary and secondary homonyms respectively. It was agreed therefore that the definitions to be adopted for these expressions should be framed on the lines suggested in paragraph 15 of Commission Paper I.C.(48)8.

(For a later decision modifying this decision, see Paris Session, 12th Meeting, Conclusion 28)

(C) *Essential differences between primary and secondary homonyms.*: In their earlier discussion regarding the type of scheme to be adopted for regulating specific homonymy, the Commission had accepted the view that every species should possess as its nomenclaturally valid specific name a binominal combination of generic and specific trivial names which was unique, not being shared with any other species. Thus, in cases where the two species concerned were no longer regarded as congeneric, it was a purely nomenclatorial consideration which pointed to the need to reject the later published of any pair of primary homonyms. The rejection of secondary homonyms rested on an entirely different foundation, for it was the taxonomic need for ensuring that every species in a given genus should have a different specific trivial name which made it essential to reject the later published of any pair of secondary homonyms. But this was not the only difference between primary and secondary homonyms: the existence of a condition of primary homonymy between two specific names was an objectively ascertainable nomenclatorial fact, whereas a condition of secondary homonymy arose only through the application by zoologists of their subjective taxonomic ideas. In the case of primary homonyms, therefore, there was no need to provide a special procedure in the *Règles* for the rejection of the later published of any pair of primary homonyms, for such a name was invalid from the moment of its publication; all that it was necessary to do was to provide rules for the replacement of invalid primary homonyms, when detected. The situation was quite different as regards secondary homonyms, for there was no directly objective test which could be applied to determine whether any pair of specific trivial names should be treated as secondary homonyms of one another. The provisions to be inserted in the *Règles* must prescribe a procedure which would result in a uniform nomenclature being applied by all concerned, not only by the author who rejects a

specific trivial name as a secondary homonym, but also by all subsequent authors who may have occasion to refer to the species concerned. This procedure must ensure that a given species would be referred to by the same specific trivial name, irrespective of the subjective taxonomic views of the authors concerned. The rules of procedure for rejecting a specific trivial name as a secondary homonym must be sufficiently precise to secure uniformity, but care would have to be taken to avoid the insertion in the *Règles* of mandatory provisions which, by aiming at too high a standard, would have the undesired effect of invalidating on technical nomenclatorial grounds specific trivial names given in replacement of invalid secondary homonyms in a manner which would be readily understood and generally acceptable. This was the error into which the Commission and the Congress had fallen when at Budapest in 1927 they had increased the precision of certain of the provisions in Article 25, an error which at the meeting noted in the margin held during their present Session the Commission had found it necessary to redress by suggesting the insertion of a more generalised phraseology in place of portions of the text adopted at Budapest and to insert the more rigid provisions in a non-mandatory form in a *Recommandation* added to the part of Article 25 concerned. In the light of this discussion it was agreed to consider the problems involved in regulating primary homonymy, before passing to the more complex problems raised by secondary homonymy.

(Previous reference:
Paris Session,
4th Meeting,
Conclusions 6, 7 & 8)

(D) *Rejection of invalid primary homonyms:* There was no need to include in the *Règles* any special procedure for the rejection of the later published of any pair of specific names which were primary homonyms of one another, for the existence of a condition of primary homonymy was a readily ascertainable objective fact and did not depend in any way upon the action of subsequent authors. All that was required, therefore, was a provision (such as that in the existing text of the *Règles*) that every such name must be rejected and that such rejection should be permanent, thus making it impossible for the rejected specific trivial name ever again to be applied to the species in question. Under this provision it would be the duty of every zoologist who encountered a situation of primary homonymy to reject the later published of the pair of specific names concerned. In order, however, to minimise the risk of the continued use of invalid primary homonyms, it was desirable that there should be added to the appropriate Article of the *Règles* a *Recommandation* strongly urging that every author who discovered that a given specific name was a primary homonym of a previously published specific name and was therefore invalid should publish a note drawing attention to this

discovery and should also notify it, by sending a marked copy of the paper containing the note in question or otherwise, to a literature-recording serial such as the *Zoological Record*, so that the discovery in question might be recorded in the next issue of that serial.

(E) *Replacement of invalid primary homonyms*: It was an essential feature of any scheme for dealing with homonyms that, where a condition of homonymy was discovered, the later published of the two homonyms concerned must be rejected and be replaced by another name. In Commission Paper I.C.(48)8 (paragraphs 32 and 34) the Acting President had expressed the view that every homonym, whether primary or secondary, should, on being discovered, at once be replaced by a new name. Only in this way would it be possible to provide the nominal species concerned with a trivial name that unquestionably belonged to it. The only circumstance in which, in the scheme suggested by the Acting President, it would not be necessary to provide a new specific trivial name for the species the name of which had been rejected as an invalid homonym would be where there existed one or more other nominal species based upon the same type specimen as the nominal species the name of which had been rejected.

In the discussion which took place on this question, it was agreed that, unless a new specific trivial name was given to a species the name of which had been rejected as an invalid homonym, the nominal species concerned would remain without an objectively available trivial name of its own. For the only other course would be subjectively to identify some other nominal species with the nominal species the name of which had been rejected as a homonym and to apply to that species the specific trivial name originally published for the other nominal species. Such a procedure inevitably carried with it an element of risk, for it would automatically break down if the subjective identification of the two nominal species were later to be found to be erroneous. On the other hand, it was felt that the inclusion in the *Règles* of a provision (such as had been suggested) making it obligatory for any worker who discovered a condition of homonymy to give a new specific trivial name to the nominal species the name of which had been rejected as an invalid homonym would lead to the publication of large numbers of trivial names which would never be used for taxonomic purposes, owing to the existence of trivial names published for other nominal species which had been subjectively identified with the nominal species the name of which had been rejected as an invalid homonym. Such a procedure would add unnecessarily to the already large

number of trivial names in synonymy. It was accordingly agreed that where the name of a species was found to be invalid by reason of being a homonym of a previously published name and where therefore it was necessary to provide that species with another name, this must be done by giving to that species a new name where there was no other nominal species which was either objectively identical with that nominal species, by reason of being based upon the same type specimen or was subjectively identified with the nominal species in question ; that, where there existed one or more nominal species based upon the same type specimen, the oldest of the trivial names of those nominal species, if otherwise available, should be treated as being the objectively available name for the species, the name of which had been rejected ; but that, where there was no nominal species based upon the same type specimen but there were one or more nominal species which were subjectively identified with the species the name of which had to be rejected as a homonym, it should be open to the author who discovered the condition of homonymy either to give a new name to the species the name of which was an invalid homonym or to apply to that species the trivial name of the nominal species which was subjectively identified with that species or, if there were more than one nominal species so identified with the species the name of which was rejected, the oldest available trivial name of any of those species. Where the author concerned elected to give a new trivial name to the species concerned, that new name would take precedence (as at present) for purposes of priority only as from the date on which it was published. It should be understood that, where the author who discovered the condition of homonymy elected not to give a new name to the species bearing the later published of the two homonymous names (preferring to apply to that species the trivial name of some other nominal species which he subjectively identified with the nominal species, the name of which had been rejected as a homonym), it would be open nevertheless to any later author, who so desired, to give a new name to that nominal species. Finally, it must be understood that where, instead of giving a new name to a nominal species, the name of which is invalid as a homonym, an author applies to such a nominal species the name of another nominal species which he subjectively identifies with the former species, the name so applied is the correct name for the nominal species in question only for so long as the two nominal species concerned are subjectively identified with one another.

(F) *Rejection of invalid secondary homonyms:* Unlike primary homonyms, secondary homonyms were necessarily

subjective in origin, depending, as they did, on the subjective taxonomic views of individual revisers. In discussing this subject in Commission Paper I.C.(48)8 (paragraph 34), the Acting President had expressed the following view: "Our aim must be to avoid the confusion to which secondary homonyms may give rise, but at the same time somehow to translate their subjective origin into objective provisions which are simple to apply and are capable of being carried out in a uniform fashion by any worker, irrespective of his individual taxonomic standpoint. The provision must permit no individual discretion and must call for no laborious researches on the part of zoologists in general and must be such as to create the maximum of uniformity and stability in nomenclature. For this reason the onus of establishing the existence of secondary homonymy should be laid squarely on those from whose taxonomic judgment such homonymy arises." In other words, the question of whether a given trivial name is to be regarded as having been validly rejected as a secondary homonym must depend exclusively upon the action of the reviser responsible for its rejection, and it was this action which should determine whether or not all zoologists were to renounce permanently the use of the trivial name in question for the species concerned.

Unlike primary homonyms, secondary homonyms had in the past been treated in a far from uniform way, owing mainly to the uncertainty on the part of zoologists as to the extent to which Articles 35 and 36 were intended to apply to this class of homonym. Some zoologists had been in the habit of rejecting names as secondary homonyms, only when they themselves regarded the species concerned as belonging to the same genus as another species which had an identical, but earlier published, trivial name; other zoologists had rejected as a secondary homonym the trivial name of any species which any author had ever treated as being in the same genus as another species having an identical but earlier published trivial name, even where they themselves (the later zoologists) regarded the species as being referable to different genera. In extreme cases a trivial name had been rejected as a secondary homonym of another trivial name, where the two species had at no one time been placed in the same genus, one of the species concerned having been removed therefrom before the other was assigned to the genus. Again, some zoologists had gone so far as to reject one trivial name as a secondary homonym of another trivial name, merely because some author, without citing by name either species, had stated that he united into a single genus two genera in each of which there was in fact a species bearing the same trivial name as that of

a species in the other genus. Again, there had been no uniformity in the treatment accorded to trivial names rejected as secondary homonyms, when on some later revision the two species concerned were placed in different genera; some authors had continued to regard the rejected name as invalid, whereas others had revived that name, as soon as the condition of secondary homonymy had in their view ceased to exist.

The new provisions in the *Règles* must lay down clearly that a specific trivial name must be rejected as a secondary homonym by any reviser, when, in his opinion, two species each having the same specific trivial name were referable to the same genus. It was an essential feature of the scheme that a specific trivial name, once rejected as a secondary homonym, should never be eligible again for use for the species concerned. It was inevitable that, whatever scheme were adopted, some changes in names would be unavoidable, in view of the lack of consistency in past practice. The aim must therefore be to keep these changes within the narrowest practicable limits. It was thought that this object could best be achieved by following the procedure adopted in other cases, that is to say by prescribing two standards, one, the more rigorous, to apply to the rejection of secondary homonyms after a future date to be specified in the *Règles*, the other, less rigorous, to apply to the rejection of names prior to that date. It was thought that the point of time dividing the two periods should be the same as that selected for other similar cases, namely midnight, G.M.T. (Greenwich Mean Time), 31st December, 1950/1st January, 1951.

It was agreed that, where, *after the specified point of time*, an author rejected the trivial name of a species as a secondary homonym of the trivial name of another species, it was essential that, in order that that rejection should be effective (i.e. that it should be binding upon all other zoologists), the author concerned should be required to make it clear, first, that he himself regarded as congeneric the two species bearing identical specific trivial names, and, second, that he rejected the later published of these names as a secondary homonym of the other. As regards names rejected as secondary homonyms, *prior to the specified point of time*, it was felt that, in view of the diversity of practice in the past, the best course would be to provide in the *Règles* that a rejection of a specific trivial name as a secondary homonym of an earlier published specific trivial name should be treated as a valid rejection, even where the author who had made the rejection did not himself consider the two species concerned to be congeneric with

one another. The advantage of this arrangement would be that it would provide a valid basis for the large number of rejections which had been made in the past by authors who accepted a wider interpretation of the rules than those now proposed to be prescribed and would in consequence secure validity for the large number of new names proposed by those authors as substitute names and now in common use.

(G) *Need for maximum publicity for the rejection of names as secondary homonyms:* After the new provisions came into operation (i.e. after 31st December, 1950) the rejection of a specific trivial name as a secondary homonym of another specific trivial name would have important nomenclatorial consequences, for, once a specific trivial name had been duly rejected as a secondary homonym in accordance with the provisions now to be inserted in the *Règles*, that rejection would be permanent and the rejected name could never again in any circumstances become the valid name for the species concerned. It was therefore of the highest importance to secure the maximum publicity for every rejection of a specific trivial name as a secondary homonym of another specific trivial name effected in the future, for it was only in this way that the specialists in the group concerned could be made aware of the fact that the name so rejected could never again validly be used for the species in question. It was felt therefore that it was most important that a *Recommandation* should be added to the appropriate Article dealing with specific homonymy strongly urging that every author who rejected a specific trivial name on account of secondary homonymy should notify that rejection as soon as possible after it had been published to a literature-recording serial such as the *Zoological Record*, by sending a marked copy of the paper containing the rejection or otherwise, so that the rejection in question might be recorded in the next issue of that serial.

(For a later decision
modifying this decision
see Paris Session,
12th Meeting,
Conclusion 28)

(H) *Secondary specific homonymy arising through an undetected condition of generic homonymy:* In view of the fact that it had already been decided to include in the definition of a secondary homonym the case where such homonymy arose not only through two species bearing the same specific trivial name being placed in the same genus but also through two species bearing identical specific trivial names, though never so united, being placed in genera which through an undetected condition of generic homonymy bore the same generic name, it would be necessary so to draft the provisions relating to the rejection of specific trivial names as secondary homonyms as to cover both classes of case.

(I) *Replacement of a specific trivial name rejected as an invalid secondary homonym:* It was agreed that the rules which had already been agreed upon for the replacement of a specific name rejected as an invalid primary homonym of another specific name should be applied to the replacement of a specific trivial name rejected as an invalid secondary homonym of another specific trivial name. It was noted, however, that the rejection of a name as a primary homonym was automatic, whereas the rejection of a name as a secondary homonym was not. It would therefore be necessary, in the case of secondary homonyms, to include in the *Règles* a provision making it clear that, where, after 31st December, 1950, a new name (as contrasted with the name of some other nominal species subjectively identified with the species concerned) is given to a species on the ground that the specific trivial name of that species is an invalid secondary homonym but the author giving that name fails to make it clear both that he is of the opinion that the condition of homonymy still exists (that is to say that he regards the species in question as one of a pair of congeneric species, each bearing the same specific trivial name, and that it is for this reason that he rejects the later published of the two specific trivial names and gives a new specific trivial name to the species in question) the existing specific trivial name of that species is to be regarded as not having been validly rejected. In such a case the new specific trivial name given to that species is to have no status in zoological nomenclature.

(J) *Need for safeguards against deliberate abuse of the provisions relating to the replacement of secondary homonyms:* It was recognised that the new scheme would be liable to misuse by any malicious or irresponsible person for the deliberate purpose of creating secondary homonyms or of providing opportunities for publishing new names. It was not thought that this was a serious risk, but it was felt that it was one which should be guarded against, so far as possible. It was accordingly agreed that a provision should be inserted in the *Règles* requiring the Commission to use their plenary powers to suppress for nomenclatorial purposes any book or paper in which, in their opinion, the provisions of the *Règles* in regard to the rejection and replacement of secondary homonyms had been deliberately misused for either or both of the purposes referred to above.

(K) *Status of subgeneric names in relation to specific homonymy:* Consideration was then given to the problem of the status, if any, to be accorded to subgeneric names in relation to specific homonymy, a question which had been raised by the Acting President in paragraphs 37 and 41(10) of Commission Paper I.C.(48)8. It was generally felt that,

as the use of subgeneric names was optional and those names did not constitute an essential feature of the name of a species, no account should be taken of subgeneric names in determining whether a given specific name was a primary homonym of another specific name or whether a given specific trivial name was a secondary homonym of another specific trivial name. It was agreed that a provision to this effect should be inserted in the *Règles* and that for this purpose Article 6 (which lays it down that generic and subgeneric names are co-ordinate with one another, that is to say of equal value) should be amended to such extent as might be necessary.

(L) *Treatment of subspecific names in relation to specific and subspecific homonymy:* The scheme so far discussed was concerned only with the situation which arose when one specific name was a primary homonym of another specific name or when one specific trivial name was a secondary homonym of another specific trivial name. As pointed out by the Acting President in Commission Paper I.C.(48)8 (paragraphs 38-39 and 41(11)), it was necessary to insert provisions to deal also with homonymy, when this arose in connection with subspecific trivial names. It was agreed that the rules applying to cases where a pair of species having identical specific trivial names were either originally described, or were subsequently placed, in the same genus or, through the accident of an undetected condition of generic homonymy, in different genera bearing the same name should apply also to cases where of two species so described or so placed (a) the specific trivial name of one species is identical with the subspecific trivial name of a subspecies of the same or another species, or (b) the subspecific trivial name of a subspecies of one species is identical with the subspecific trivial name of a subspecies of the same or another species. Words should, however, be inserted to prevent the subspecific trivial name of the nominotypical subspecies of a species from being rejected as a homonym of the specific trivial name of that species.

(M) *The expression "of the same origin and meaning" as used in paragraph (3) of the existing text of Article 35:* The Commission then turned to consider the expression "of the same origin and meaning" as used in the third paragraph of the existing text of Article 35 of the *Règles*. As pointed out by the Acting President in Commission Paper I.C.(48)8 (paragraph 40), the limitation imposed in this paragraph of Article 35 by the words quoted above made it impossible in many cases to apply the provisions of that paragraph, owing to the impossibility of determining whether any given pair of names differing from one another to the slight

(For a later decision
modifying this
decision, see Paris
Session, 12th Meeting,
Conclusion 28)

extent specified in that paragraph were or were not of the same origin and meaning. Even where it was possible to find an answer to this question, it was often necessary to devote a large amount of time to the study of the origin and meaning of the Latin or Latinised Greek words concerned, which could be much more profitably spent on zoological work. It was agreed to recommend that the expression "of the same origin and meaning" should be deleted from the Article which would replace the third paragraph of the existing Article 35 and that in its revised form the provision now embodied in that paragraph should merely lay it down that any pair of trivial names (whether specific or sub-specific) which differed from one another only by the differences in spelling specified in that paragraph were to be treated as homonyms of one another.

(For a later decision qualifying this decision, see Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion 43)

At the conclusion of the foregoing discussion, THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend:—

- (1) that the present Articles 35 and 36 should be deleted from the *Règles* and that there should be inserted in their place Articles giving effect to the provisions specified in (2) to (21) below;
- (2) that, as a first step towards the regulation of homonyms, words should be inserted in the *Règles* defining the expression "homonym" and expressly recognising the existence for nomenclatorial purposes of two types of specific homonym, to be known as "primary homonyms" and "secondary homonyms" respectively, these expressions to be defined as follows:—

<i>Expression</i>	<i>Definition of expression</i>
"Homonym"	Where the same name is applied to two different units belonging to the same taxonomic category, for example, to two different genera or two different species, each of the names so used is a "homonym" of the other.
"Primary homonym"	Where two species at the time of the original publication of their names are placed in the same genus or are placed in different genera which, through the accident of an undetected condition of generic homonymy, bear the same name, and each species is given the same specific trivial

(For a later decision modifying this decision, see Paris Session, 12th Meeting, Conclusion 28)

name, each of the specific names (binomial combinations of a generic name and a specific trivial name) so published is a "primary homonym" of the other specific name.

"Secondary homonym"

Where two species which at the time of the original publication of their names are placed in different genera and are given the same specific trivial name are later placed in the same genus or are placed in different genera which, through the accident of an undetected condition of generic homonymy, bear the same name, each of the specific names so formed is a "secondary homonym" of the other specific name.

(*For a later decision, modifying this decision, see Paris Session, 12th Meeting, Conclusion 28*)

- (3) that a specific name which is the later published of a pair of specific names which are primary homonyms of one another is to be treated as having been invalid as from the date of its publication and is to be permanently rejected;
- (4) that, in order to minimise the risk of the continued use of invalid primary homonyms, a *Recommandation* should be added to the appropriate Article of the *Règles* strongly urging that every author who discovers that a given specific name is an invalid primary homonym of another specific name should publish a note drawing attention to this discovery and should notify it to a literature-recording serial such as the *Zoological Record*, by sending a marked copy of the paper containing the note, or otherwise, so that the discovery in question may be recorded in the next issue of that serial;
- (5) that, when the specific name (binomial combination of a generic name and a specific trivial name) of a nominal species is found to be an invalid primary homonym and, in consequence, that name (hereinafter referred to as the "rejected name") is permanently rejected, the name to be applied to that nominal species shall be determined in accordance with the rules specified below:—
 - (a) where there exists a nominal species (i) which possesses an available name and is based upon the same type specimen as the nominal species bearing the rejected name and (ii) which has as its specific trivial name a name different from that comprised in the rejected name (such a nominal species being hereinafter referred to as an "objectively substitutable nominal

species ")), the objectively available specific name of the nominal species bearing the rejected name shall be the specific name borne by the objectively substitutable nominal species, and that name shall take precedence under the Law of Priority as from the date on which it was first published;

- (b) where there exist two or more objectively substitutable nominal species, the objectively available specific name of the nominal species bearing the rejected name shall be the first published of the specific names of any of the objectively substitutable nominal species concerned and shall take precedence in like manner as specified in (a) above;
- (c) where there exists no objectively substitutable nominal species, as aforesaid:—

(1) the author discovering the condition of primary homonymy may either give to the nominal species bearing the rejected name a new specific name consisting of a binomial combination of a generic name and of a specific trivial name different from that comprised in the rejected name, the specific name so given becoming the objectively available specific name of that nominal species and taking precedence under the Law of Priority as from the date on which it was so published, or

(2) if from the subjective taxonomic standpoint of the author discovering the condition of primary homonymy, there is no need to give a new specific name to the nominal species bearing the rejected name, that author may elect to leave that nominal species without an objectively available specific name of its own, it being understood in such a case that it shall be open at any later date for the same or any other author to give to that nominal species a new specific name comprising a specific trivial name different from that comprised in the rejected name, the specific name so given thereupon becoming the objectively available specific name of that nominal species and taking precedence under the Law of Priority in like manner as specified in (1) above;

- (6) that the specific trivial name to be applied to the taxonomic species represented by a nominal species bearing a rejected name (as defined in (5) above) shall be determined in accordance with the Law of Priority, that is to say:—

(a) where there exist one or more nominal species which are either (i) objectively substitutable nominal species (as defined in (5) (a) above) or (ii) nominal species bearing available names comprising specific trivial names different from that comprised in the rejected name referred to above, which is, or which are, subjectively identified with the nominal species bearing the rejected name (such a nominal species being hereinafter referred to as a "subjectively substitutable nominal species"), the specific trivial name properly applicable to the taxonomic species represented by the nominal species bearing the rejected name shall be the first published of the specific trivial names of any of those nominal species, provided that, if that name is the name of a nominal species which is subjectively but not objectively a substitutable nominal species, that name shall cease to be the specific trivial name properly applic-

able to that taxonomic species, if later, and for so long as, the nominal species to which that name was originally given ceases to be subjectively identified with the nominal species bearing the rejected name;

- (b) where there exists neither an objectively nor a subjectively substitutable nominal species, the nominal species bearing the rejected name is to be given a new specific name comprising a specific trivial name different from that comprised in the rejected name, the specific trivial name so given becoming thereupon the name properly applicable to the taxonomic species represented by the nominal species bearing the rejected name for so long as no subjectively substitutable nominal species having an earlier published name is subjectively identified as also representing that taxonomic species;
- (7) that, where a specific name is the later published of a pair of secondary homonyms, the trivial name concerned is to be rejected by any author who is of the opinion that the condition of homonymy still exists, that is to say, if he regards the two species as being congeneric with one another, but in no other circumstances;
- (8) that, where, prior to midnight G.M.T. (Greenwich Mean Time), 31st December, 1950/1st January, 1951, an author makes it clear that he rejects a specific trivial name on the ground that it is part of the later published of a pair of secondary homonyms, that rejection is to be accepted as valid, irrespective of whether the author makes it clear that he himself considers that the condition of homonymy still exists, that is to say, whether he regards the two species as congeneric with one another;
- (9) that, where, subsequent to the point of time specified in (8) above, an author rejects a specific trivial name on the ground that it is part of the later published of a pair of secondary homonyms, that rejection is to be accepted as valid, only if the author in question makes it clear (a) that he regards as congeneric the two species bearing identical specific names and (b) that he rejects the later published of these names as an invalid homonym of the other;
- (10) that a specific trivial name rejected under either (8) or (9) above is never to be used again for the same species;
- (11) that such adaptations should be made in (7) to (10) above as may be necessary to make those provisions apply not only to the case where a pair of secondary homonyms occur in a single genus but also where a pair of secondary homonyms occur through the fact that a given specific trivial name is used for one species in one genus and also for another species in a different genus, which, through the accident of

(For a decision reversing the decision here recorded, see Paris Session, 12th Meeting, Conclusion 28)

an undetected condition of generic homonymy bears the same generic name as that of the genus to which the other species is referred ;

- (12) that, in view of the importance of securing that, whenever the specific trivial name of a species was duly rejected, in accordance with (7) above, as part of an invalid secondary homonym of the specific name of another species, the fact that that name had been so rejected should be brought prominently to the notice of interested specialists, in order to minimise the risk of the continued use of that name in contravention of the provisions of (10) above, a *Recommandation* should be added to the appropriate Article of the *Règles* strongly recommending that every author who rejects a specific trivial name as part of an invalid secondary homonym should notify that rejection as soon as possible after its publication, to a literature-recording serial such as the *Zoological Record*, by sending a marked copy of the paper containing that rejection or otherwise, so that the rejection in question may be recorded in the next issue of that serial ;
- (13) that, when the specific name (binominal combination of a generic name and a specific trivial name) of a nominal species is found to be an invalid secondary homonym and in consequence the specific trivial name comprised in that specific name (hereinafter referred to as the "rejected trivial name") is permanently rejected in accordance with the provisions of (7) above, the specific trivial name to be applied to that nominal species shall be determined in accordance with the rules specified below :—
 - (a) Where there exists an objectively substitutable nominal species (as defined in (5) above, the objectively available specific trivial name of the nominal species bearing the rejected trivial name shall be the specific trivial name borne by the objectively substitutable nominal species, and that name shall take precedence under the Law of Priority as from the date on which it was first published ;
 - (b) Where there exist two or more objectively substitutable nominal species, the objectively available specific trivial name of the nominal species bearing the rejected trivial name shall be the first published of the specific trivial names of any of the objectively substitutable

nominal species concerned and shall take precedence in like manner as specified in (a) above;

(c) where there exists no objectively substitutable nominal species, as aforesaid :—

- (1) the author discovering the condition of secondary homonymy may either give to the nominal species bearing the rejected trivial name a new specific name consisting of a binominal combination of a generic name and a specific trivial name different from the rejected trivial name, the specific trivial name so given becoming the objectively available specific trivial name of that nominal species and taking precedence under the Law of Priority as from the date on which it was so published, or
- (2) if, from the subjective taxonomic standpoint of the author discovering the condition of secondary homonymy, there is no need to give a new specific name to the nominal species bearing the rejected trivial name, that author may elect to leave that nominal species without an objectively available specific name of its own, it being understood in such a case that it shall be open at any later date for the same or any other author to give to that nominal species a new specific name comprising a specific trivial name different from the rejected trivial name, the specific trivial name so given thereupon becoming the objectively available specific trivial name of that nominal species and taking precedence in like manner as specified in (1) above;

(14) that the specific trivial name to be applied to the taxonomic species represented by a nominal species bearing a rejected trivial name (as defined in (13) above) shall be determined in accordance with the Law of Priority, that is to say :—

- (a) where there exist one or more nominal species which are either (i) objectively substitutable nominal species (as defined in (5) above) or (ii) subjectively substitutable nominal species (as defined in (6) above), the specific trivial name properly applicable to the taxonomic species represented by the nominal species bearing the rejected trivial name shall be the first published of the specific trivial names of any of those nominal species, provided that, if that name is the name of a nominal species which is subjectively but not objectively a substitutable nominal species, that name shall cease to be the specific trivial name properly applicable to that taxonomic species, if later, and for so long as, the nominal species to which that name was originally given ceases to be subjectively identified with the nominal species bearing the rejected trivial name.
- (b) where there exists neither an objectively nor a subjectively substitutable nominal species, the nominal species bearing the rejected trivial name is to be given a new specific name comprising a specific trivial name different from the rejected trivial name, the specific trivial name so given becoming thereupon the name properly applicable to the taxonomic species represented by the nominal species bearing the rejected trivial name for so long as no subjectively substitutable nominal species having an earlier published name is subjectively identified as also representing that taxonomic species.

(15) that, when, after the point of time specified in (8) above, a new specific name is given to a nominal species on the ground that

the specific name of that nominal species is an invalid secondary homonym but the author who gives the new name fails to make it clear both that he is of the opinion that the condition of homonymy still exists, that is to say that he regards the species in question as one of a pair of congeneric species, each bearing the same specific name, and that it is for this reason that he rejects the later published of the two specific trivial names and gives a new specific trivial name to the species in question, the existing specific trivial name of that species is to be regarded as not having been validly rejected and in consequence the new specific trivial name given to that species is to have no status in zoological nomenclature;

- (16) that, in order to minimise the risk of the foregoing provisions relating to specific homonymy being abused by irresponsible or malicious persons for the deliberate purpose of creating secondary homonyms or of providing opportunities for publishing new names, a provision should be inserted in the *Règles* requiring the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to use their plenary powers to suppress for nomenclatorial purposes any book or paper, in which, in their opinion, the provisions of the *Règles* in regard to the rejection and replacement of secondary homonyms had been deliberately misused for either or both of the purposes referred to above;
- (17) that provisions should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear that subgeneric names are to be disregarded for the purpose of determining whether a given specific name is a primary homonym of another specific name or whether a given specific trivial name is a secondary homonym of another specific trivial name, and that Article 6 should be amended to such extent as may be necessary for this purpose;
- (18) that the provisions in the *Règles* relating to cases where a pair of species having identical specific trivial names were either originally described, or were subsequently placed, in the same genus or, through the accident of an undetected condition of generic homonymy, in different genera bearing the same generic name, should apply also to cases where of two nominal species so described or so placed
 - (a) the specific trivial name of one species is identical with the subspecific trivial name of a subspecies of the other species or (b) the subspecific trivial

(For a later decision
modifying this decision,
see Paris Session, 12th
Meeting, Conclusion 28)

name of a subspecies of one species is identical with the subspecific trivial name of a subspecies of the same or of another species, save that nothing in the foregoing provisions should be held to invalidate the subspecific trivial name of the nominotypical subspecies of a species having two or more subspecies on the ground that that name is the same as the specific trivial name of the species itself;

(19) that there should be omitted from the provision which is to replace the third paragraph of Article 35 (which prescribes that certain trivial names which differ from one another only in the ways there specified are to be treated as homonyms of one another), the condition that such names must be of the same origin and meaning and that the opening words of the new provision should be drafted so as to provide merely that within a given genus any pair of trivial names (whether specific or subspecific) which differ from one another only by the differences in spelling specified in that paragraph are to be treated as homonyms of one another.

(For a later decision qualifying this decision, see Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion 43)

Need for publicity for new names and for selections of type species of genera

2. During the discussion recorded in Conclusion 1 above, THE COMMISSION had under consideration recommendations submitted by the Acting President in Commission Paper I.C.(48)8 (paragraphs 33, 34, 41(13)) in favour of the insertion in the *Règles* of a *Recommandation* to be attached to the appropriate Article strongly recommending that every author who publishes a new specific name in replacement of an invalid primary homonym or a new specific trivial name in replacement of an invalid secondary homonym should notify the publication of that name to the *Zoological Record* or other literature-recording serial, so that the new name so published might be recorded in the next issue of that serial. At the same time the Acting President had suggested that this *Recommandation* should be so drafted as to apply not only to names published in replacement of invalid homonyms but also to all names published for new species.

In the ensuing discussion general agreement was expressed with the proposal submitted but it was felt that the procedure suggested should apply not only to new specific and subspecific names but also to new names of all taxonomic categories recognised by the *Règles*, that is to say, at one end of the scale to the names of new Families, Sub-families, genera and sub-genera, and at the other end of the scale to the names of infra-subspecific forms. The view was expressed also that it was highly desirable that a corresponding *Recommandation* should be added to Article

30, strongly recommending that every author who selects a nominal species to be the type species of a nominal genus should notify that selection to a literature-recording serial with a view to its being recorded in the next issue of that serial.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

Publicity for new family and sub-family names

Publicity for new generic, subgeneric specific, subspecific, and infra-subspecific names

Publicity for the selection of the type species of genera established prior to 1st January 1931

- (1) that a *Recommandation* should be added to Article 4 strongly urging that every author who establishes a new Family or a new Sub-family should notify the establishment of that Family or Sub-family as soon as possible after the publication of the paper in which it is established, to a literature-recording serial such as the *Zoological Record*, by sending a marked copy of the paper concerned or otherwise, in order that the name of the new Family or Sub-family, as the case may be, may be recorded in the next issue of that serial ;
- (2) that a *Recommandation* should be added to Article 25 strongly recommending that every author who publishes a new generic or a new subgeneric name, either as the name of a new genus or subgenus or in replacement of a generic or subgeneric name which is invalid as a homonym or who publishes a new name for a species, subspecies or infra-subspecific form or who elevates to specific or subspecific rank a name originally published for an infra-subspecific form or who publishes a name to replace a specific, subspecific, or infra-subspecific name which is invalid as a homonym should notify the publication or, as the case may be, the elevation, of that name as soon as possible after its publication to a literature-recording serial such as the *Zoological Record*, by sending a marked copy of the paper concerned or otherwise, so that that new name or, as the case may be, that elevation of the status of a name may be recorded in the next issue of that serial ;
- (3) that a *Recommandation* should be added to Article 30 strongly recommending that every author who selects a nominal species to be the type species of a nominal genus established prior to 1st January, 1931 should notify that type selection as soon as possible after its publication to a literature-recording serial such as the *Zoological Record*, either by sending a marked copy of the paper concerned or otherwise, so that that type selection may be recorded in the next issue of that serial.

**Definition of the
expressions
"specific name"
and "specific
trivial name"**

3. In the course of the discussion recorded in Conclusion 1 above, it became evident that (as pointed out by the Acting President in paragraph 30 of Commission Paper I.C.(48)8) any consideration of the problem of specific homonymy involved both the concept of the binomial combination which constitutes the scientific designation of a species and also the concept of that portion of that designation which distinguishes a given species from all other species in the same genus. In the existing text of the *Règles* both these concepts were referred to under the expression *nom spécifique* (specific name). In order to put an end to the confusion so caused, it was essential that in the revised text of the *Règles* these concepts should be distinguished from one another by means of clearly defined expressions. The distinction between these concepts and the need for a definition of each had been recognised by Linnaeus himself who had applied the expression *nomen specificum* to designate the binomial combination which constitutes the scientific designation of a species and the expression *nomen triviale* for the portion of the scientific designation of a species which distinguishes the species concerned from every other species in the same genus.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

- (1) that, in order to put an end to the present state of confusion, it was essential that the *Règles* should distinguish clearly between the binomial combination which constitutes the scientific designation of a species and the second term of such a combination, which distinguishes a given species from every other species referred to that genus;
- (2) to recommend :—
 - (a) that, in order to give effect to the considerations specified in (1) above, words should be inserted in the *Règles* expressly recognising the two concepts referred to above, the first of these to be designated by the expression "specific name", the second by the expression "specific trivial name";
 - (b) that the foregoing expressions should be defined in the *Règles* as follows :—

<i>Expression</i>	<i>Definition of expression</i>
"Specific name"	The binomial combination of a generic name and a specific trivial name which constitutes the scientific designation of a species.

“Specific trivial name”

The second term of the binominal combination which constitutes the scientific designation of a species, being the portion of that designation which distinguishes the species concerned from every other species referred to the genus concerned.

(c) that, wherever the expression “specific name” is used in the *Règles* in the sense not of a “specific name”, as defined in (b) above but in the sense of a “specific trivial name”, as there defined, the latter expression should be substituted for the former.

**Definition of the expressions
“subspecific name” and
“subspecific trivial name”**

(Previous reference :
Paris Session,
5th Meeting,
Conclusion 1 (2)
and (3))

4. In the course of the discussion recorded in Conclusion 3 above, it was pointed out that there was an ambiguity in the use in the *Règles* of the expression “subspecific name” exactly parallel to the ambiguity already noted in the case of the expression “specific name”. As it had now been decided to eliminate the ambiguity in the case of the latter expression, it followed that it would be necessary to take corresponding action in regard to the expression “subspecific name”.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

- (1) that words should be inserted in the *Règles* distinguishing clearly between the trinominal combination which constitutes the scientific designation of a subspecies and the third term of such a combination, which distinguishes a given subspecies of a particular species from every other subspecies of that species, the first of these concepts to be designated by the expression “subspecific name”, the second by the expression “subspecific trivial name”;
- (2) that the foregoing expressions should be defined in the *Règles* as follows :—

<i>Expression</i>	<i>Definition of expression</i>
“Subspecific name”	The trinominal combination of a generic name, a specific trivial name and a subspecific trivial name which constitutes the scientific designation of a subspecies.
“Subspecific trivial name”	The third term of the trinominal combination which constitutes the

scientific designation of a subspecies, being the portion of that designation which distinguishes the subspecies concerned from every other subspecies of the species in question.

(3) that, wherever the expression "subspecific name" is used in the *Règles* in the sense not of a "subspecific name", as defined in (2) above, but in the sense of a "subspecific trivial name", as there defined, the latter expression should be substituted for the former.

Specific trivial names always to be published in connection with generic names

5. In the course of the discussion on the replacement of secondary homonyms recorded in Conclusion 1 above, the view was expressed that care should be taken to make it absolutely clear in the *Règles* that, when a new specific trivial name was published in substitution for a specific trivial name that had been rejected on account of secondary homonymy, the new name so published must, in order to be an available name, be published, if not in actual combination with a generic name, at least in connection with such a name. There were cases in the literature where this had not been done and where in consequence it was necessary to infer from the context the name of the genus to which the author of the new specific name intended to refer the species in question. It was pointed out that it was not only in connection with new specific trivial names published in substitution for invalid secondary homonyms that there existed this risk, for there were cases in the literature in which an author, either not knowing, or being doubtful regarding, the genus to which he should refer a new species which he was describing, had published a specific trivial name for that species without indicating any generic name for it.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend:—

that words should be inserted in the *Règles* making it clear that no specific trivial name published either for a previously undescribed species or in substitution for a specific trivial name rejected as an invalid homonym possesses any status in zoological nomenclature, unless the author concerned specifies a generic name in connection therewith.

Co-ordination of the Laws of Priority and Homonymy

6. During the discussion recorded in Conclusion 1 above regarding the status of a new name published in substitution for an invalid homonym (whether primary or

secondary), attention was drawn to the fact that the present text of the *Règles* was defective in that the Articles dealing respectively with the Law of Priority (Article 25) and the Law of Homonymy (Articles 34-36) appeared to have been drawn up entirely independently of one another with the result that each lacked a qualifying reference to the other. It was pointed out on the one hand that in addition to the existing provisions in Article 25 that Article should contain a provision that the oldest published name for a genus, subgenus, species, subspecies or infra-subspecific form would not be the valid name of the genus, subgenus, species, subspecies or infra-subspecific form concerned if it was a name which was invalid under the Law of Homonymy (at present dealt with in Articles 34-36). Similarly, in the Articles which would replace Articles 34-36 in the revised text of the *Règles*, it would be necessary to make it clear that a name which does not satisfy the Law of Priority does not invalidate, under the Law of Homonymy, a later-published name consisting of the same word.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to co-ordinate the Law of Priority (Article 25) and the Law of Homonymy (Articles 34-36) with one another, this object to be attained by inserting in :—

- (a) the Article dealing with the Law of Priority a provision that, even if a name satisfies all the requirements specified in Article 25, that name is not a valid name if it falls to be rejected under the Law of Homonymy ;
- (b) the Articles dealing with the Law of Homonymy a provision that a name which does not satisfy the Law of Priority does not invalidate, under the Law of Homonymy, a later-published name consisting of the same word.

Application to generic names of the provisions in the third paragraph of Article 35 relating to specific trivial names
(Previous reference: Lisbon Session, 4th Meeting, Conclusion 14)

7. In the course of the discussion recorded in Conclusion 1 above regarding the provision relating to the rejection on account of homonymy of a specific trivial name which differed from another specific trivial name only in any of the small points of spelling listed in the third paragraph of the existing text of Article 35, THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) reminded the Commission that by a decision taken at their Session held at Lisbon in 1935 the Commission had given an interpretation of Article

34 applying, *mutatis mutandis*, to generic names the provisions in regard to specific trivial names referred to above. That decision had later been formally embodied in the Commission's *Opinion* 147. In view of the decision just taken by the Commission to recommend the deletion from the third paragraph of Article 35 of the words "of the same origin and meaning", it followed automatically that a corresponding amendment should now be made in *Opinion* 147. The Commission had however already agreed at their present Session to incorporate in the *Règles* provisions embodying the interpretations of existing Articles given by the Commission in interpretative *Opinions* and they would shortly be considering the paper (Commission Paper I.C.(48)11) which had been submitted by himself on this subject. The Acting President suggested that the most convenient course might be for the Commission to confine itself to taking note that *Opinion* 147 now required amendment but to defer taking a decision in regard to that amendment until they came to consider the question of incorporating into the *Règles* the interpretation given in that *Opinion*.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

- (1) that, if the Congress approved the recommendation which it had been agreed to submit for the amendment of the third paragraph of Article 35 relating to homonymy in specific trivial names by the deletion of the qualifying words "of the same origin and meaning", it would be necessary to ensure that simultaneously with the adoption of that amendment, a corresponding amendment should be made in *Opinion* 147, in which the foregoing paragraph of Article 35 had been applied to generic homonymy (Article 34);
- (2) to defer further consideration of this question until they came to consider the proposals for incorporating into the *Règles* the interpretations thereof given in interpretative *Opinions* rendered by the Commission submitted in Commission Paper I.C.(48)11.

(Later reference:
Paris Session,
6th Meeting,
Conclusion 41)

Thanks of the
Commission to
Mrs. M. F. W.
Hemming

8. THE COMMISSION agreed :—

to place on record their grateful thanks to Mrs. M. F. W. Hemming for the active part which, in conjunction with her husband, Secretary Francis Hemming, she had played in preparing the proposals

submitted to the Commission in regard to the problem of specific homonymy (Commission Paper I.C.(48)8) and the nomenclature of infra-specific forms (Commission Paper I.C.(48)9).

MRS. HEMMING thanked the Commission for the resolution which they had just adopted.

Codification of the interpretations of the "Règles" given in "Opinions" rendered by the Commission: future procedure in regard to

(Previous reference:
Lisbon Session,
4th Meeting,
Conclusion 15)

9. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a memorandum by the Secretary to the Commission on the need for the codification of the interpretations of the *Règles* given in *Opinions* rendered by the Commission in their judicial capacity (Paper I.C.(48)10).

In introducing this subject, THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) recalled that many important interpretations of the *Règles* had been given by the Commission in *Opinions* rendered at various times since 1907, the year in which the International Congress of Zoology had conferred upon the Commission the right and the duty to render *Opinions* on questions of zoological nomenclature submitted to them. Many of these interpretations had been given incidentally in *Opinions* dealing with the status of particular names and it was therefore not surprising that some of them had been widely overlooked. At their meeting held in Lisbon in 1935 the Commission had reviewed their practice in this matter and had agreed that, when in future they reached a decision of interest to the general body of zoologists, that decision should be presented in such a way as to ensure that it was most readily available to all concerned. The revised procedure then agreed upon had been consistently followed in all subsequent *Opinions*. It represented a substantial improvement on previous practice, but nevertheless it touched only the fringe of the problem. Much more drastic action would be needed in order to put an end to the chaotic situation which confronted zoologists who desired to ascertain whether any particular provision of the *Règles* had been the subject of an interpretative *Opinion* rendered by the Commission. When during the war the Commission had taken stock of the problems which they would need to tackle immediately the war was over, they had included in their programme the publication of an authoritative edition of the substantive French text of the *Règles*, and the re-issue of their earlier *Opinions* which had long been out of print and were virtually unobtainable. The Commission had then proposed to attach to the proposed edition of the *Règles* an analysis of those of their *Opinions* which contained interpretations of provisions in the *Règles*. The preparation

of this analysis, which had occupied over two years, had proved laborious and difficult owing largely to the need to distinguish carefully between the actual decisions taken by the Commission on the one hand, and on the other the numerous *obiter dicta* embodied in the texts of many *Opinions* which had the appearance of being views expressed by the Commission but were in fact no more than the personal views of the draftsmen of the *Opinions* concerned. Simultaneously with the preparation of the foregoing analysis of the *Opinions* rendered by the Commission, a start was made with the re-publication of the older *Opinions*. This was long overdue, for owing to these *Opinions* having been for so long out of print, they were known to the majority of zoologists only through their "summaries" which often failed to give a clear picture of the decision taken in those cases where the ostensible object of the *Opinion* was to give a ruling on the status of some particular name, while by far the most important part of the *Opinion* was the decision taken on the interpretation of some provision of the *Règles*. Attached to each of the *Opinions* so re-issued were editorial notes prepared by himself (the Acting President) in his capacity as Secretary to the Commission. Both the projected analysis of the interpretative *Opinions* and the publication of an annotated edition of the older *Opinions* represented steps in the right direction, but each fell short of the ideal solution, for neither the analysis nor the annotations to the older *Opinions* could in the circumstances do more than represent the views of the author by whom they were compiled. Obviously, it would be much more satisfactory if means could be found to secure in these matters an authoritative pronouncement made, on the advice of the Commission, by the Congress itself.

The Acting President went on to say that within the last 18 months the whole question had been carefully reviewed and the conclusion had been reached that the right and proper course would be to take advantage of the meeting in Paris of the International Congress of Zoology to seek the concurrence of the Congress in a comprehensive codification of the interpretative *Opinions* rendered by the Commission during the last 40 years. Periodical codifications of this kind were a normal feature in the development of law in countries in which the law consisted partly of statute law and partly of case law built up from interpretative decisions taken by the Courts. Only by this means was it possible to prevent the law from becoming unduly difficult to interpret and in the course of time so complicated and obscure as almost to defy interpretation. Fortunately the *Règles* had not yet reached that stage but

signs were not wanting that the *Règles* and the *Opinions* taken together were becoming so complicated as to make their interpretation by working zoologists unnecessarily time-consuming and burdensome. From the consultations which had taken place on this matter it was evident that a codification of the kind proposed would be widely welcomed by zoologists. Once the proposed codification had been carried through, zoologists would be able not only to see what was the present state of the law but also to determine much more easily than was at present possible the directions in which further developments or amendments were required.

Vitally important as it was that order should be introduced into the *Règles* by the codification of the interpretative *Opinions* rendered by the Commission, it was equally essential that the Commission should never again permit a recurrence of the present state of confusion. It was accordingly suggested that, when in future the Commission were called upon to give an interpretation of a given provision of the *Règles*, they should not only do so in the most categorical and unambiguous terms but should also so draft the interpretation so given that it could readily be written into the *Règles* at the next meeting of the International Congress. The consistent application of this principle would secure that the current authorised edition of the *Règles* would contain provisions on all matters on which interpretative judicial decisions had been taken by the Commission up to and including the last meeting of the Congress. In order to ascertain the state of the law, a zoologist would therefore only have to consult the *Règles* and such few interpretative decisions as the Commission might have rendered since the last Congress. The Acting President added that, in order to facilitate reference to interpretative decisions of this kind, it was proposed that in future *Declarations* should be reserved for recording this type of decision, decisions relating to the status of individual books and of individual names, together with decisions relating to the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" being recorded, as at present, in *Opinions*.

(Previous reference:
Paris Session,
4th Meeting,
Conclusions 3 & 5)

(Previous reference:
Paris Session,
4th Meeting,
Conclusion 6)

The Commission had already noted that in three cases at least interpretations given in *Opinions* were manifestly incorrect and the Commission had agreed to cancel the *Opinions* in question (*Opinions* 20, 37 and 8). In another case the Commission had agreed to recommend that a particular provision of the *Règles* (Article 25, Proviso (c) (2)) should be amended and in consequence an *Opinion* (*Opinion* 138) giving an interpretation of the passage now to be deleted from that Article had become inappropriate and

misleading. In this case also the Commission had agreed to cancel the *Opinion* in question. *Opinions* containing interpretations of the *Règles* would be in a different position after those interpretations had been written into the *Règles* as the result of the proposed codification. Such *Opinions* would no longer be an authorised source to which zoologists could look for interpretations of the *Règles*, since for this purpose those *Opinions* would have been superseded by the new provisions inserted in the *Règles*. It was desirable, however, that such *Opinions* should remain on record for historical purposes, but it was essential that it should be made clear that every such *Opinion* was repealed for interpretative purposes. Where an *Opinion* contained both an interpretation of the *Règles* and also a decision regarding the status of a particular book or a particular name, that *Opinion*, though repealed in so far as it contained an interpretation of the *Règles*, would remain in full force, so far as the decision in regard to a particular book or a particular name was concerned.

(*For later decisions on this subject, see Paris Session, 9th Meeting, Conclusion 31; 12th Meeting, Conclusion 19*)

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

- (1) *as regards "Opinions" already rendered by the Commission (i.e. Opinions 1—194) :—*
 - (a) *to cancel any Opinion :—*
 - (i) *which might be found to contain an erroneous interpretation of a provision in the Règles, the said cancellation to become operative forthwith ;*
 - (ii) *which contained an interpretation of a provision of the Règles which, though correct under the existing text of the Règles, would cease to be correct as soon as the present (Paris) Congress had approved the recommendation to be submitted to them for the amendment or deletion of the provision interpreted in the Opinion in question, the said cancellation to become operative as from the date on which the amendments to the Règles made by the present Congress came into force ;*
 - (b) *to repeal for interpretative purposes any Opinion or part of an Opinion containing an interpretation of a provision of the Règles, where the present Congress decided to incorporate that interpretation, in whole*

or in part, in the text of the *Règles*, the said repeal to become operative as from the date on which the amendments to the *Règles* made by the present Congress come into force;

(c) to request any zoologist who might consider that any *Opinion*, other than an *Opinion* that had been cancelled or an *Opinion* repealed for interpretative purposes under (a) or (b) above, contained an interpretation of the *Règles* on a matter not expressly dealt with therein which through inadvertence had either not been incorporated in the *Règles* as part of the present codification or had not been expressly repealed for interpretative purposes, to notify the Commission as soon as possible, so that they might consider what recommendation in regard thereto to submit to the next meeting of the Congress;

(d) to place on record their intention:—

(i) to make proposals to the next (XIVth) meeting of the Congress for the incorporation in the *Règles* of any interpretation thereof given in any *Opinion* rendered prior to July 1948 which they might find was inadvertently not incorporated in the *Règles* by the present Congress and which they might deem expedient should be so incorporated;

(ii) to repeal for interpretative purposes every *Opinion* rendered prior to the above date which might not already have been either cancelled or repealed for interpretative purposes under (a) or (b) above, the said repeal to become operative as from the date on which the amendments to the *Règles* made by the next Congress came into force;

(2) as regards "Declarations" and "Opinions" rendered after the close of the present Congress:—

(a) to reserve the series entitled *Declarations* for the recording of interpretations of provisions of the *Règles* and the consequent submission of proposals for the amendment

of the *Règles* and the series entitled *Opinions* for decisions relating to the status of individual books and of individual names, together with decisions relating to the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology";

- (b) to lay it down that the decision given in any *Declaration* or *Opinion* is to be looked for only in the "summary" of that *Declaration* or *Opinion*, that every such "summary" is to be rigidly construed, and that no deductions, other than those expressly specified therein, are to be drawn therefrom;
- (c) to place on record that no new interpretation of any provision of the *Règles* is to be drawn from any *Opinion*, every such interpretation to be recorded in a *Declaration*, as provided in (a) above;
- (d) to report to each meeting of the Congress any interpretations of provisions of the *Règles* which they may have given in a *Declaration* or *Declarations* rendered since the last previous meeting of the Congress, with a recommendation that every such interpretation be incorporated forthwith in the *Règles*;
- (e) to repeal for interpretative purposes any *Declaration*, the contents of which shall have been incorporated into the *Règles* by direction of a meeting of the Congress, acting on a recommendation submitted to it in accordance with (d) above, the said repeal to become operative as from the date on which the amendments to the *Règles* made by that Congress shall come into force;

(3) to incorporate into the By-Laws of the Commission the provisions specified in (2) above.

Interpretations of provisions in the "Règles" given in "Opinions": proposals for incorporation in the "Règles" to be considered item by item

(Previous reference:
Paris Session,
4th Meeting,
Conclusion 4 (2) (a))

10. THE COMMISSION had before them a memorandum by the Secretary to the Commission containing detailed proposals for the codification of the interpretations of various provisions in the *Règles* given by the Commission in *Opinions* rendered at various dates from the year 1907 onwards (Commission Paper I.C.(48)11).

THE COMMISSION :—

- (1) recalled that, since Commission Paper I.C.(48)11 had been prepared, they had agreed in principle

at the meeting noted in the margin to recommend the incorporation in the *Règles* of provisions embodying the interpretations of existing Articles given by the Commission in *Opinions* already rendered, subject to such modifications or exceptions as they might consider proper ;

- (2) agreed to examine Commission Paper I.C.(48)11, paragraph by paragraph, with a view to reaching conclusions regarding the recommendations to be submitted in this regard.

**Article 4 and
"Opinion" 141
(Family names)**

11. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the interpretation of Article 4 of the *Règles* given in *Opinion* 141 and the proposals in regard thereto submitted in paragraphs 1-3 of the list contained in Commission Paper I.C.(48)11.

In the discussion on this question it was generally agreed that the existing provisions (Articles 4 and 5) in regard to Family and Sub-Family names constituted a totally inadequate treatment of this complicated problem. It was not possible on the present occasion to study this matter in the requisite detail but it was very desirable that the issues involved should be thoroughly investigated as soon as possible.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

- (1) that the Secretary to the Commission should be invited to make a thorough study, in consultation with interested specialists, of the problem of the nomenclature of Super-Families, Families, Sub-Families and Tribes and to submit a Report thereon, with recommendations, for consideration by the Commission at their meeting to be held during the next (XIVth) meeting of the Congress, with a view to the submission by the Commission of proposals for the insertion in the *Règles* of comprehensive provisions dealing with this subject ;

- (2) that, without prejudice to (1) above :—

- (a) words should be inserted to make it clear :—

- (i) that the genus bearing the oldest available generic name in a family need not be taken as the type genus of a family ;

- (ii) that an author establishing a new family is free to select as the type genus of that family whatever genus he considers the most appropriate ;

- (iii) that the name of a family is to be based upon the name of its type genus, and that the selection of a given generic name to be the basis of a family name constitutes *ipso facto* a definite designation of the genus bearing that name to be the type genus of that family. Example: The genus *Musca* Linnaeus, 1758, was definitely designated as the type genus of the family MUSCIDAE by reason of the fact that the stem of the word "Musca" was used as the basis of that family name.
- (iv) that the provisions of (i) to (iii) above are to apply to the names of sub-families in like manner as to the names of families;
- (b) a *Recommandation* in the following sense should be added to the provision specified in (a) (ii) above: "The genus selected to be the type genus of a family should, so far as possible, be a well-known and common genus and one which, from the taxonomic standpoint, occupies a central position in the family so established."
- (c) a *Recommandation* in the following sense should be added to the provision specified in (a) (iii) above: "Where a well-established family name has not been formed in accordance with (iii) above but where it would be undesirable to change existing practice, authors should, before making any such change, refer the question to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for such action as it may think proper."

**Article 8 and
"Opinion" 183
(generic names to
be published in
the nominative
singular)**

12. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the interpretation of Article 8 of the *Règles* given in *Opinion* 183 and the proposals in regard thereto submitted in paragraph 4 of the list contained in Commission Paper I.C.(48)11.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend:—

that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear that the provision in Article 8 that a generic

(*Later reference :
Paris Session,
7th Meeting,
Conclusion 7*)

Article 14, first paragraph, and "Opinion" 64 (single letters not eligible as trivial names)

Status of specific trivial names when preceded by serial letters or serial numerals at the time of their original publication

(*Later reference :
Paris Session,
12th Meeting,
Conclusion 32*)

name is to consist of a noun in the nominative singular requires that no name is to be accepted as a generic name until it has been published as a noun in the above case and number and that a noun first published in some other case or number is available as a generic name only as from the date on which it is for the first time published in the nominative singular and is to be attributed to the author by whom it is first so published.

13. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the interpretation of the first paragraph of Article 14 of the *Règles* given in *Opinion* 64 and the proposals in regard thereto submitted in paragraph 5 of the list contained in Commission Paper I.C.(48)11.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear that a single letter, such as "a", "b", "c", etc. is not to be accepted as the trivial name of a species or subspecies.

14. In the course of the discussion (recorded in Conclusion 13 above), regarding the codification of the interpretation of Article 14 of the *Règles* given in *Opinion* 64, attention was drawn to the fact that, where an author, in giving a list of the species which he referred to a given genus, had placed a serial letter or a serial numeral immediately in front of the trivial name of the species concerned, some later authors had sought to argue that, in the case of any new name published in this manner, the serial letter or the serial numeral, as the case might be, should be regarded as forming part of the trivial name.

In order to eliminate discussion on this contention, which was clearly misconceived, it would, it was felt, be helpful if words were inserted in the *Règles* making it clear that serial letters and serial numerals, when used in the manner indicated above, do not form part of the trivial name of the species concerned.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that words should be inserted at some appropriate point in the *Règles* making it clear that, where a new specific trivial name is published in a list of species referred to a given genus and is there preceded by a serial letter or serial numeral, that serial letter or serial numeral is not to be taken as constituting part of the specific trivial name in question.

**Article 19 and
"Opinions" 26, 27,
29, 36, 41, 60, 61 and
63 (emendation of
names)**

15. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the interpretations of Article 19 of the *Règles* given in *Opinions* 26, 27, 29, 36, 41, 60, 61, and 63, and the proposals in regard thereto submitted in paragraphs 7-9 of the list contained in Commission Paper I.C.(48)11.

In the discussion on this question, the following points were made :—

- (a) In various respects the interpretation of Article 19 had been rendered more, rather than less, difficult by the *Opinions* given by the Commission at various times, for some of those *Opinions* were irreconcilable both with the terms of Article 19 itself and with the interpretation of that Article given in other *Opinions*.
- (b) It was evident that, before a satisfactory solution could be reached in regard to the complex of problems raised by this Article, a much closer study than any hitherto attempted would need to be made. Further, this study would need to be directed to the substantive French text of this Article, rather than to the imperfect English translation of that text commonly in use, to which most of the discussions hitherto had been directed.
- (c) Various proposals had been received for making changes in Article 19, but it was very difficult to judge the merits of these proposals until the present meaning of that Article had been clarified by the incorporation into it of such of the interpretations given by the Commission in *Opinions* on particular cases as were consistent with the meaning of the words actually used in the Article itself. The consolidation of the present law in this matter was thus an indispensable preliminary to the consideration of its development or reform.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

- (1) that the Secretary to the Commission should be invited to make a thorough study, in consultation with interested specialists, of the problems involved in the emendation of scientific names which, when originally published, contained errors of transcription or of orthography or printers' errors and to submit a Report thereon, with recommendations, for consideration by the Commission at their meeting to be held during the next (XIVth) meeting of the Congress, with a view to the submission by the Commission of proposals for the insertion in the *Règles* of comprehensive provisions dealing with this subject ;

(2) that, without prejudice to (1) above :—

(a) words should be inserted in Article 19 to make it clear that, in determining whether, as regards any given name, an error of transcription or of orthography or a printers' error is "évident" in the original spelling of a scientific name, particular attention should be paid to evidence contained in the book or paper in which the name was first published ;

(b) it should be made clear in Article 19 in some manner which will not detract from the generality of the expression "évident" as used in that Article that the following examples illustrate cases where the original spelling of a name should be emended :—

(i) Where it is evident that a generic name or a specific trivial name is based upon a personal name and where the spelling of the scientific name so published is not identical, except for the termination used, with the correct spelling of the name of the person to whom the genus or species is dedicated, the spelling of the scientific name in question is to be emended so as to correspond with the correct spelling of the name of that person. Example: The names *Ruppelia* Swainson, 1839, and *Rupelia* Swainson, 1839, are to be emended to *Rüppellia*, in view of the fact that this genus was dedicated to a zoologist named Rüppell.

(ii) When an author founds a new name upon one or more Greek words but inadvertently commits an error in transliterating into the Latin alphabet one or more of the Greek letters of which the word was (or the words were) composed, the error of transcription is to be corrected. Example: The inadvertent mis-transliteration of the Greek letter Zeta committed in the spelling "Pentoxocera", a name formed

from the Greek words $\piέντε$ (five), $οξος$ (branch), and $κέρας$ (horn), is to be corrected and the spelling of this name is to be emended to "Pentozocera".

- (iii) When an author founds a new name upon one or more Greek words cited in the original publication of the name and when one of those words is there incorrectly spelt and in consequence the scientific name founded thereon is also incorrectly spelt, the spelling of that name is to be emended. Example : The authors of the generic name which was originally published as "Athlennes" stated that that name was based upon a Greek word similarly spelt (i.e. a word having the Greek letter Theta as its second letter). In fact, however the Greek word concerned had as its second letter the Greek letter Beta. The spelling of this generic name is therefore to be emended to "Ab-lennes".
- (iv) When an author founds a trivial name upon the locality or district from which the type specimen was obtained but, as the result of his misreading or miscopying the name of the locality or district from the label on the type specimen, publishes as the trivial name of the species a Latinised word which fails to indicate the locality or district intended, the spelling of the name so published is to be emended. Example : When Günther gave to a new fish the name *Leuciscus hakuensis*, he selected that trivial name because he had misread as "Lake Hakou" the locality of the type specimen of this species. In fact, however, the name of the type locality was "Lake Hakone". In these circumstances, the trivial name *hakuensis* is to be emended to *hakonensis*.

(v) When an author, in naming a new species, selects for its trivial name a word which, though adjectival in form, is not a recognised Latin adjective and where that author uses for the nominative singular of that word the termination “-ius” (masculine) or “-ia” (feminine), these terminations are to be corrected to “-eus” and “-ea” respectively. Example: The word “iridia” (published by Gibbons in 1855 as a new trivial name in the combination *Salmo iridia*), though adjectival in form, is not a recognised Latin adjective. This trivial name is, therefore, to be emended to *irideus* (masculine), *iridea* (feminine), or *irideum* (neuter).

**Article 25 and
“Opinion” 2
(status of a name
based on a
hypothetical form)**

16. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the interpretation of Article 25 of the *Règles* given in *Opinion* 2 (which relates to the status of a name based upon a hypothetical form) and the proposals in regard thereto submitted in paragraph 10 of the list contained in Commission Paper I.C.(48)11.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend:—

that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear that a name based upon a hypothetical form has no status in zoological nomenclature. Example: The generic name *Pithecanthropus* Haeckel, 1866, being the name of a genus based upon a hypothetical species, has no status in zoological nomenclature and does not preoccupy the generic name *Pithecanthropus* Dubois, [1894], the name of a genus based upon a known species.

**Article 25 and
“Opinion” 49
(status of a specific
name published
conditionally)**

17. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the interpretation of Article 25 of the *Règles* given in *Opinion* 49 (which relates to the status of a specific name published conditionally) and the proposals in regard thereto submitted in paragraph 11 of the list contained in Commission Paper I.C.(48)11.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend:—

(a) that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear that, where an author doubtfully identifies known material with a described species but publishes for that material a new specific

name for use therefor if later it is found that that material is referable to an unnamed species, the specific name, given conditionally in this manner, is available for that species as from the date of its original publication and is to be attributed to its original author. Example: The specific name *Siphonophora asclepiadifolii*, given conditionally by Thomas in 1879 to known material which he doubtfully identified with a previously named species (*Aphis asclepiadis* Fitch) is available as from 1879 for the material so named by Thomas.

- (b) that a *Recommandation* should be inserted at an appropriate point in the *Règles* strongly deprecating the publication of names conditionally.

**Article 25 and
"Opinion" 4
(status of a
manuscript name
on being first
validly published
with an
"indication")**

(Later reference:
Paris Session,
7th Meeting,
Conclusion 15)

18. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the interpretation of Article 25 of the *Règles* given in *Opinion 4* (which relates to the status of a name which, prior to being published, was a manuscript name) and the proposals in regard thereto submitted in paragraph 12 of the list contained in Commission Paper I.C.(48)11.

It was pointed out in discussion that the expression "printed in connection with the provisions of Article 25" used in *Opinion 4* was not happily chosen: (1) because it prejudged the question whether, in order to be accepted, a book containing new names must be actually printed, as contrasted with being reproduced by some other process (a subject on which proposals would be submitted to the Commission at a later meeting during its present Session), and (2) because it was difficult to regard a manuscript name rejected by the author by whom it was first published as the name by which the genus or species concerned had been first designated ("... sous lequel ils ont été le plus anciennement désignés") as prescribed in the opening words of the Article. What was intended was, no doubt, that a manuscript name, to become available, must first be published ("divulgué dans une publication") in conditions which satisfied the requirements of the provisos to Article 25. It would be well to make this clear, now that the decision in this *Opinion* was to be incorporated in the *Règles*.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend:—

(Later reference:
Paris Session,
9th Meeting,
Conclusion 28)

that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear that a manuscript name acquires status in zoological nomenclature only when it is validly published and, on being so published, is published in conditions which satisfy the requirements of the

provisos to Article 25, and that the status of a manuscript name, so published, is not affected by the question whether the author by whom it is published accepts it as an available name or sinks it as a synonym.

**Article 25 and
"Opinions" 87, 59,
and 190 (various
aspects
of the problem
of publication)**

(*For a later decision
amplifying the present
decision, see Paris
Session, 7th Meeting,
Conclusion 15*)

19. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the interpretations of aspects of the problem raised by the expression "divulgué dans une publication" as used in Article 25 given by the Commission in *Opinion 87* (which relates to the status of a name when it appears for the first time in a proof sheet) in *Opinion 59* (which relates to the status of a name which first appears in an advance separate) and in *Opinion 191* (which relates to the status of a name when it appears for the first time in documents, etc., distributed by an author to colleagues or students), together with the proposals thereon submitted in paragraphs 15, 17 and 14 of the list contained in Commission Paper I.C.(48)11.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear :—

- (a) that the distribution of proof sheets does not constitute publication and that a new name given currency in this way has no status in zoological nomenclature until such later time as it is duly published in accordance with the provisions of Article 25 ;
- (b) that, where a new name appears in a paper published in a book or serial and separates of that paper are distributed in advance of the publication of the paper concerned, the new name ranks for the purposes of the Law of Priority not from the date of the distribution of the separates but from the later date on which the paper was actually published either in that book or serial or elsewhere.
- (c) that a new name introduced in a note (whether printed or otherwise reproduced) in explanation of a photograph or other illustration of an animal is not "divulgué dans une publication" where the author concerned does no more than distribute copies of such a note and photograph or other illustration to colleagues or students or when he merely attaches copies of such a note and illustration to separates of a paper dealing with the same subject but either not

containing the new name in question or containing it without satisfying the requirements of Article 25. Example: The specific name *Rhynchonella alta* has no status under the Law of Priority as from the date (about 1878) on which it appeared in a note with accompanying photograph distributed by Samuel Calvin but ranks for purposes of priority as from 1890 when it was published with an indication by H. S. Williams.

**Articles 30 and 35
and "Opinion"
148 (status and
type species of a
generic name
published as an
invalid emendation
of an earlier name)**

20. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the interpretations of Articles 30 and 35 of the *Règles* given in paragraph (1) of *Opinion 148* (which relates to the status of a generic name published as an invalid emendation of, or as a substitute for, an earlier generic name of the same origin and meaning) and the proposals in regard thereto submitted in paragraphs 16 and 26 of the list contained in Commission Paper I.C.(48)11.

It was pointed out that the decision given in the *Opinion* referred to above carried with it the corollary that, if a generic name which had been invalidly emended was later rejected as an invalid homonym, the invalid emendation of that name becomes an available name for the genus concerned, as from the date on which it was originally published. In the example given in *Opinion 148*, *Achatinus* de Montfort, 1810, was rejected as a synonym of *Achatina* Lamarck, 1799, of which it was an invalid emendation. Like any other synonym, *Achatinus* de Montfort would become an available name for the genus concerned, if it were to be found that the earlier name (*Achatina* Lamarck, 1799), of which it had been sunk as a synonym, was an invalid homonym. The decision in this part of *Opinion 148* was subject to the limitation imposed by *Opinion 147* (proposals for the incorporation in the *Règles* of which were submitted in paragraph 41 of the list contained in Commission Paper I.C.(48)11) that the original name and the invalidly emended version should not be so similar to one another in spelling as to fall within the categories of names which, under that *Opinion*, were to be treated as homonyms of one another. It was pointed out also that, in view of the decision taken earlier during the present meeting to recommend that the phrase "of the same origin and meaning" should be deleted from the third paragraph of Article 35 (which relates to specific homonymy, that phrase (which had been introduced into *Opinion 148* by analogy from Article 35) should be omitted in the proposed incorporation in the *Règles* of the decision given in paragraph (1) of *Opinion 148*.

*(Previous reference:
Paris Session,
6th Meeting,
Conclusion 1(21)*

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—
that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear :—

- (a) that a generic name published as an invalid emendation of an earlier name (an emendation made otherwise than in accordance with Article 19) is to be rejected as a synonym of the earlier name, where that name is an available name, the type species of the later published nominal genus being automatically the same species as the type species of the earlier published nominal genus ;
- (b) that, where the name of a genus is rejected as an invalid homonym and the next oldest name is a name published as an invalid emendation of that name and that invalid emendation is sufficiently different in spelling from the original name not to be a homonym thereof under the provisions contained in the third paragraph of Article 35 as applied to Article 34 by *Opinion* 147, the generic name originally published as an invalid emendation becomes an available name for the genus in question and has priority as from the date on which it was first published as an invalid emendation and is to be attributed to the author by whom it was so published.

Article 25,
Proviso (a), and
“Opinion” 1
(meaning of the
expression
“indication”)

21. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the interpretation of Proviso (a) to Article 25 of the *Règles* given in *Opinion* 1 (which relates to the meaning of the expression “indication” as used in the Proviso in question), together with the proposals in regard thereto submitted in paragraph 18 of the list contained in Commission Paper I.C.(48)11.

In the discussion on this proposal, it was pointed out that, since the foregoing paper had been prepared, the Commission had decided to recommend the liberalisation of the third of the provisions relating to generic names specified in *Opinion* 1. It remained now to consider the codification (and to such extent as might be necessary, the clarification) of (1) the remaining portion of *Opinion* 1 as regards generic names, and (2) the whole of the portion of that *Opinion* which was concerned with specific trivial names, and the concluding sentence of that *Opinion*, which referred both to generic names and to specific trivial names. In the decision to be taken on these matters it would be necessary to make it clear that the whole of the interpretation of the expression “indication” here under consideration related

only to names published prior to 1st January, 1931, the date on which the more rigorous provisions of Proviso (c) to Article 25 came into operation.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear, as regards generic names and specific trivial names published prior to 1st January, 1931 :—

- (a) that a specific trivial name is to be accepted as having been published with an “ indication ” if it is published (i) with a bibliographical reference to a previously published definition or description, or (ii) in conjunction with a figure (illustration), or (iii) as a substitute for a previously published name which is invalid as a homonym ;
- (b) that a generic name is to be accepted as having been published with an “ indication ” if it is published (i) with a bibliographical reference to a previously published definition or description, or (ii) in the manner agreed upon at the meeting noted in the margin, or (iii) as a substitute for a previously published name which is invalid as a homonym ;
- (c) that neither a reference to a museum label nor to a museum specimen nor to a vernacular name is to be accepted as an “ indication ” either for a generic name or for a specific trivial name.

(Later reference:
Paris Session,
12th Meeting,
Conclusion 29)

(Previous reference:
Paris Session,
4th Meeting,
Conclusion 13)

**Article 25,
Proviso (a), and
“ Opinion ” 43
(status of a new
specific name
published jointly
with a new generic
name and vice
versa)**

22. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the interpretation of Proviso (a) to Article 25 of the *Règles* given in *Opinion 43* (which relates to the status of a new specific name published jointly with a new generic name), together with the proposals in regard thereto submitted in paragraph 19 of the list contained in Commission Paper I.C.(48)11.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear that, where, prior to 1st January, 1931, a new nominal species was described in a new nominal genus and the genus and species concerned were described jointly, no separate description being given for either, the joint description so given is to be accepted as an “ indication ” both for the new generic name and for the new specific name.

**Article 25,
Proviso (a), and
"Opinion" 52
(significance of the
citation of a type
locality in an
original description)**

23. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the interpretation of Proviso (a) to Article 25 of the *Règles* given in *Opinion* 52 (which relates to the significance to be attached to the citation of a type locality in the original description of a new species) and the proposals in regard thereto submitted in paragraph 20 of the list contained in Commission Paper I.C.(48)11.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear that the citation of a type locality unaccompanied by any other particulars, does not constitute an "indication" for the purposes of Proviso (a) to Article 25.

**Article 25,
Proviso (b), and
"Opinion" 5
(status of a name
originally published
before 1758 when
re-published after
1757)**

24. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the interpretation of Proviso (b) to Article 25 of the *Règles* given in *Opinion* 5 (which relates to the circumstances in which a name originally published before the starting point of zoological nomenclature in 1758 (Article 26) is to be accepted as an available name on being republished after the close of 1757), together with the proposals in regard thereto submitted in paragraph 21 in the list contained in Commission Paper I.C.(48)11.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear that a name which, by reason of having been published before the starting point of zoological nomenclature (i.e. prior to 1st January, 1758), possesses no status under the *Règles* does not acquire such status if, when republished after 1757, it is simply reprinted with its original diagnosis, it being necessary, if such a name is to acquire rights under the *Règles*, that, on being republished, it should be reinforced by being adopted or accepted by the author by whom it is republished.

**Article 26 and
"Opinion" 3
(relative
status of works
published in the
year 1758)**

25. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the interpretation of Article 26 of the *Règles* given in *Opinion* 3 (which relates to the status to be accorded to works published in the year 1758), together with the proposals in regard thereto submitted in paragraph 24 of the list contained in Commission Paper I.C.(48)11.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend:—

that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear that any work published in the year 1758 is to be treated as having been published subsequent to the 10th edition of the *Systema Naturae* of Linnaeus and therefore subsequent to the starting point of zoological nomenclature.

**Articles 25 and
31 and
“Opinion” 88
(status of a specific
name published
for a composite
nominal species)**

26. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the interpretation of the *Règles* given in *Opinion* 88 (which relates to the status of the name of a nominal species, the original description of which contained descriptions of the bodily parts of more than one species and to the status of the name of a genus having such a nominal species as its type species), together with the proposals in regard thereto submitted in paragraph 25 of the list contained in Commission Paper I.C.(48)11.

In the discussion on this matter, it was pointed out that *Opinion* 88 was silent regarding the Article or Articles of which it gave an interpretation. This was a question which must, however, be determined before the ruling given in this *Opinion* could be incorporated in the *Règles*. Although, at first sight, this *Opinion* appeared to be concerned with the question of the availability of certain classes of names, it was evident on closer inspection that the main purpose of the *Opinion* was first to lay down the proposition that the name of a nominal species based on the description of parts of different animals belonging to more than one species was an available name in the same sense that the name of a composite nominal species based upon two or more taxonomic species was an available name but, like such a name, was indeterminate until the appropriate steps had been taken under the *Règles* to determine the identity of the taxonomic species to which the name should adhere. The problem here concerned was therefore one relating to Article 31. The second issue raised by this *Opinion* was the status of a generic name, in a case where the type species of the genus concerned was, when first published, a nominal species which was taxonomically indeterminate by reason of being based upon more than one taxonomic species. In such a case it would clearly be necessary to apply the procedure laid down in Article 31, thereby establishing the identity of the nominal species concerned, before it would be possible to determine the identity of a genus having such a nominal species as its type species. The *Règles* contained provisions for determining the identity of a genus based on two or more species (Article 30) and for determining the identity of a composite nominal species

based on two or more taxonomic species (Article 31). It was perhaps a weakness in the *Règles* that there was not also a provision, which would appropriately form part of Article 25, expressly laying it down that the name of a nominal species is not invalidated by reason of that species being, when first published, a composite species consisting of two or more taxonomic species. The incorporation of the ruling given in *Opinion* 88 provided a convenient opportunity for the insertion of such a provision. There was clearly no need to incorporate in the *Règles* any provision relating to the status of a generic name in a case where the type species was, when first published, an indeterminate composite nominal species, for once it was made clear that the name of such a nominal species was an available name and it was clearly laid down how the identity of such a composite species was to be determined, there could be no doubt as to the status of the name of a genus having such a species as its type species.

At the conclusion of the discussion, THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

- (1) that a provision should be inserted at some appropriate point in the *Règles* making it clear that a specific name is not invalidated by reason of the fact that, in the original description of the nominal species to which that name was applied, there were included descriptions either of two or more species or of parts of different animals belonging to two or more species ;
- (2) that words should be inserted in the revised text which it had been agreed should be inserted in the *Règles* in place of the existing Article 31 to make it clear that the provisions of that Article applied not only to the case where the original description of a nominal species contained descriptions of two or more species but also to the case where the original description of such a species contained descriptions of parts of different animals belonging to two or more species.

(Previous reference:
Paris Session,
4th Meeting,
Conclusion 11)

**Article 30, Rule (a),
and "Opinion" 7
(type species of a
genus the name of
which was
published with the
formula "n.g.,
n.sp.")**

27. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the interpretation of Rule (a) in Article 30 of the *Règles* given in *Opinion* 7 (which relates to the question of the type species of a genus established prior to 1st January, 1931, with the formula "n.g., n.sp."), together with the proposals in regard thereto submitted in paragraph 27 of the list contained in Commission Paper I.C.(48)11.

The attention of the Commission was drawn to the fact that, although the obvious intention of the Commission in *Opinion* 7 was to lay down that, in the case of a genus with no designated type species, where the expression "n.g.,

n.sp." was used in relation to one but not more than one of the included species, that species was to be taken as the type species, the wording actually used in that *Opinion* applied also to the case where the foregoing expression was used in relation also to two or more species. In such a case the *Opinion* became meaningless, for it was impossible for a genus to have more than one species as its type species. It was important that, when this *Opinion* was codified, it should be made clear that the decision given in it applied only to the case where the expression "n.g., n.sp." was used in relation to one but not more than one species.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend:—

that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear that, where, prior to 1st January, 1931, the name of a nominal genus was published without a designated or indicated type species, but the formula "n.g., n.sp." or an exactly equivalent formula was employed in relation to that nominal genus and to one but not more than one new nominal species described thereunder, the employment of such a formula is to be taken as constituting the designation of the nominal species in question as the type species of the nominal genus concerned.

**Article 30, Rule (c),
and "Opinion" 47
(type species of a
genus for which
only one nominal
species is cited by
the original author)**

28. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the interpretation of Rule (c) in Article 30 of the *Règles* given in *Opinion* 47 (which relates to the type species of a genus which was not intended by its original author to be monotypical but for which only one species was definitely cited by name at the time of the original publication of the generic name), together with the proposals in regard thereto submitted in paragraph 28 in the list contained in Commission Paper I.C.(48)11.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend:—

that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear that, where a genus is established without a designated or indicated type species and only one nominal species is cited as being referable to that genus, the nominal species so cited is the type species of the genus by monotypy, irrespective of whether or not the author concerned regarded the genus as monotypical.

**Article 30, Rule (d),
and "Opinion" 18
(type species of a
nominal genus,
an included
nominal species
of which has**

29. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the interpretation of Rule (d) in Article 30 of the *Règles* given in *Opinion* 18 (which relates to the questions whether it is necessary that, in order that the type species of a genus

**a synonym
possessing a
tautonymous trivial
name not cited in
the original
publication)**

shall be determined by absolute tautonomy, the tautonymous specific or subspecific trivial name must actually be cited in the original publication of the generic name), together with the proposals in regard thereto submitted in paragraph 29 of the list contained in Commission Paper I.C.(48)11.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear that, where, prior to 1st January, 1931, a genus was established with no designated or indicated type species and one of the included nominal species had at that time either as its valid name or as a synonym a specific trivial name consisting of the same word as the generic name or had a subspecies the subspecific trivial name of which consists of such a word, it is immaterial for the purposes of Rule (d) in Article 30 whether the tautonymous specific or subspecific trivial name was or was not cited in the original publication of the generic name.

**Article 30, Rule (d),
and "Opinion" 16
(type species of a
nominal genus of
which an included
nominal species had
a pre-1758 tautony-
mous univerbal
specific name cited
as a synonym)**

*(Previous reference:
Paris Session, 6th
Meeting, Conclusion
27)*

30. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the interpretation of Rule (d) in Article 30 of the *Règles* given in *Opinion* 16 (which relates to the type species of a genus established without a designated or indicated type species but containing a species for which a pre-1758 univerbal specific name consisting of the same word as the generic name is cited as a synonym), together with the proposals in regard thereto submitted in paragraph 30 of the list contained in Commission Paper I.C.(48)11.

The attention of the Commission was drawn to the fact that the wording employed in *Opinion* 16 suffered from a defect similar to that which had already been noted in *Opinion* 7. In the present case the Commission had clearly intended to lay down a rule that, where a genus established without an expressly designated type species had among its originally included species one for which a particular type of synonym was cited at the time of the original publication of the generic name, that species was to be treated as being the type species by absolute tautonomy. As drafted, however, *Opinion* 16 applied also to the case where there were two or more originally included species for each of which a synonym of the special kind envisaged was cited. In such a case the ruling in *Opinion* 16 became meaningless, for no genus could have more than one species as its type species. In this case also it was important that, on codification, it should be made clear that the decision applied only to the case where one but not more than one of the originally included species was distinguished by having among its

cited synonyms a synonym of the special kind dealt with in this *Opinion*.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear that, where, prior to 1st January, 1931, a genus was established without a designated or indicated type species and where in the synonymy cited for one, but not more than one, of the included nominal species there was cited a name which, prior to 1758, had been published as a univerbal specific name and that name consists of the same word as the name of the new genus to which the species in question was referred, the nominal species under which the pre-1758 tautonymous univerbal specific name was cited as a synonym is the type species of the genus by absolute tautonymy.

**Article 30, Rule (f),
and "Opinion" 35
(type species of a
substitute genus
where one or more
of the originally
included species
were not cited
under a binominal
name)**

31. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the interpretation of Rule (f) in Article 30 of the *Règles* given in *Opinion* 35 (which relates to the species eligible for selection as the type species of a genus established as a substitute genus, where either genus when originally established contained species which are recognisable but which were not on that occasion cited under binominal names), together with the proposals in regard thereto submitted in paragraph 31 of the list contained in Commission Paper I.C.(48)11.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear that, where, prior to 1st January, 1931, a generic name was published as a substitute for another generic name and where no type species had been designated, indicated, or selected for either of the nominal genera so named, any of the species cited in the original publication as referable to the genus bearing the older name, as well as any of the species cited in the original description of the genus having the substitute name, where some or all of these are different, is eligible for subsequent selection by the same or another author as the type species of the genus having the substitute name (and therefore as the type species of the original genus) and that for this purpose it is not necessary that the species so selected should have been cited under a binominal name when originally cited either in the original genus or in the genus established in substitution therefor.

**Article 30, Rule (g),
and "Opinion" 35
(type species of a
nominal species
where one or more
of the originally
included species**

32. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the interpretation of Rule (g) in Article 30 of the *Règles* given in *Opinion* 35 (which lays down for Rule (g) a proposition similar to that which it lays down for Rule (f) as regards the

**were not cited
under a binomial
name)**

eligibility of a species not originally cited under a binomial name for selection by a subsequent author as the type species of a genus), together with the proposals in regard thereto submitted in paragraph 32 of the list contained in Commission Paper I.C.(48)11.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear that, where, prior to 1st January, 1931, a genus was established without a designated or indicated type species, any of the species originally included in the genus is eligible for subsequent selection by the same or another author as the type species of the genus, irrespective of whether or not that species was cited under a binomial name at the time of the original publication of the generic name.

**Article 30, Rule (g),
and "Opinion" 10
(type species of
genera having
identical limits)**

33. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the interpretation of Rule (g) in Article 30 of the *Règles* given in *Opinion* 10 (which relates to the type species of genera established with identical limits), together with the proposals in regard thereto submitted in paragraph 33 of the list contained in Commission Paper I.C.(48)11.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear that, where, prior to 1st January, 1931, two or more genera with identical limits (i.e. with the same included nominal species) were formed independently by different authors and neither genus or none of the genera had a designated or indicated type species, any of the included nominal species may be subsequently selected by the same or another author to be the type species of either or all of the genera concerned.

**Article 30, Rule (g),
and "Opinion" 62
(a nominal species
eligible for selection
as the type species
of more than one
nominal genus)**

34. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the interpretation of Rule (g) in Article 30 of the *Règles* given in *Opinion* 62 (which lays down the proposition that a nominal species which is the type species of one genus is not thereby excluded from selection to be the type species of another genus), together with the proposals in regard thereto submitted in paragraph 34 of the list contained in Commission Paper I.C.(48)11.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear that in the case of a genus established prior to 1st January, 1931, without a designated or indicated type species, any author may later select to be the type species of that genus any of the originally included

nominal species, irrespective of whether the nominal species so selected may already be the type species of another nominal genus.

**Article 30 and
"Opinion" 164
(type species of a
genus not affected
by the subjective
union of that
genus with another
genus)**

35. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the interpretation of Article 30 of the *Règles* given in *Opinion* 164 (which lays it down that the type species of a genus is not subject to change upon the union of the genus concerned with another genus), together with the proposals in regard thereto submitted in paragraph 35 of the list contained in Commission Paper I.C.(48)11.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear that, when two or more genera are subjectively united on taxonomic grounds, such union in no way affects the type species of the genera concerned, the combined genus so formed taking as its name the oldest available name of any of the nominal genera concerned and the genus bearing that name retaining as its type species the nominal species previously designated, indicated or selected as such.

**Article 30, Rule (g),
and "Opinion" 6
(special method of
selecting the type
species of a genus
established before
1931 with only two
included species)**

36. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the interpretation of Rule (g) in Article 30 of the *Règles* given in *Opinion* 6 (which lays it down that the type species of a genus established without a designated or indicated type species and containing two, but not more than two, originally included nominal species is automatically determined when one of the nominal species becomes the type species of a monotypical genus), together with the proposals in regard thereto submitted in paragraph 36 of the list contained in Commission Paper I.C.(48)11.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :— that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear that, where, prior to 1st January, 1931, a genus established without a designated or indicated type species contains two, but not more than two, originally included nominal species and later the same or another author designates or indicates one of those nominal species as the type species of a new monotypical genus, that action automatically constitutes the selection of the remaining species as the type species of the original genus.

**Article 30, Rule (g),
and "Opinion" 14
(selection of a
nominal species to
be the type species
of a genus not
invalidated where**

37. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the interpretation of Rule (g) in Article 30 given in *Opinion* 14 (which lays it down that, where an author, in selecting a nominal species to be the type species of a genus established without a designated or indicated type species, himself

**the author making
the selection him-
self misidentifies
the species which he
so selects)**

misidentifies the species which he so selects, that error does not invalidate the selection of the type species so made) and the proposals in regard thereto submitted in paragraph 37 of the list contained in Commission Paper I.C.(48)11.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear that, where, prior to 1st January, 1931, a genus was established without a designated or indicated type species and at any time after the date of publication of the generic name in question an author selects one of the originally included nominal species to be the type species but, in doing so, himself misidentifies the species which he so selects, that selection is not invalidated by reason of the error so committed.

**Article 30 (all
Rules) and
"Opinions" 65 and
168 (the original
author of a generic
name to be assumed
to have identified
correctly the
nominal species
referred by him to
the genus so named)**

38. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the interpretation of Article 30 given in *Opinions* 65 and 168 (which lay down the proposition that an author who publishes a generic name is in the first instance to be assumed to have identified correctly the species referred by him to the genus so named) and the proposals in regard thereto submitted in paragraph 38 of the list contained in Commission Paper I.C.(48)11.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

- (1) that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear that an author who publishes a name for a genus is, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, to be assumed to have identified correctly the nominal species referred by him to the genus so named and therefore that, where either the original author himself designates or indicates, or the same or some other author later selects, one of the originally included nominal species to be the type species of the genus, the designation, indication or, as the case may be, the selection so made, is not to be rejected on the ground that the original author of the generic name misidentified some other nominal species with that nominal species, but
- (2) that, where there were grounds for considering that such a species had been misidentified by the original author of the genus, the case was to be submitted to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature which, if satisfied that the species in question had been so misidentified, was, under its plenary powers, to designate as the type species of the genus concerned, either (a)

THANKS TO U.N.E.S.C.O.

The International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature, on behalf of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, have great pleasure in expressing their grateful thanks to the UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANISATION (U.N.E.S.C.O.) for the financial assistance afforded towards the cost of producing the present volume.

BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Notice to subscribers regarding the arrangements made for the completion of volume 1 and for the publication of volumes 2, 3, 4 and 5

The following arrangements have been made for completing volume 1 of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* and for the publication of volumes 2, 3, 4 and 5 :—

Volume 1 : A concluding Part (Part 12), containing, *inter alia*, the Title Page, Table of Contents, and alphabetical subject index, will be published shortly.

Volume 2 : This volume, like Volume 1, will be devoted to the publication of applications in regard to nomenclatorial problems submitted by specialists to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for decision. Publication will commence at an early date.

Volume 3 : This volume, which is now complete in 9 Parts, is devoted to the publication of the memoranda, reports and other documents considered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and by the Section on Nomenclature of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology at their meetings held in Paris in July 1948.

Volume 4 : This volume will be devoted to the publication of the *Official Record of Proceedings of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature at its Session held in Paris in July 1948*. Parts 1-9 have already been published and the remaining Parts are in the press.

Volume 5 : At the request of the Bureau of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, this volume will be devoted to the publication of the *Official Record of Proceedings of the Section on Nomenclature of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, July 1948*, together with the Reports submitted to the Congress by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and the Section on Nomenclature.

INQUIRIES

All inquiries regarding publications should be addressed to the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature, and all inquiries regarding the scientific work of the Commission to the Secretary to the Commission at the following addresses :—

International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature : 41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7, England.

International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature : Secretariat of the Commission, 28 Park Village East, Regent's Park, London, N.W.1, England.